DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 038 444 UD 009 834

AUTHOR	Stewart, Colleen; And Others
TITLE	Open Enrollment: Services to Children in Receiving Elementary, Intermediate and Junior High Schools, and Academic High Schools. Evaluation of ESEA Title I Projects in New York City, 1968-69.
INSTITUTION	Center for Urban Education, New York, N.Y. Educational Research Committee.
REPORT NO	CUE-P-1269; E008e
PUB DATE	Nov 69
NOTE	174p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.75 HC-$8.80
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Aspiration, Compensatory Education, Disadvantaged Youth, Elementary Schools, Federal Programs, *Free Choice Transfer Programs, Guidance Services, High Schools, Junior High Schools, *Minority Group Children, *Open Enrollment, Reading Diagnosis, *Reading Improvement, Self Concept
IDENTIFIERS	*Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I Program, ESEA Title I Programs, New York City

ABSTRACT

The Open Enrollment (OE) Program of New York City allows parents of minority group children the option to transfer their children to predominantly white schools. However, the program also includes students who were transferred to such schools through a Board of Education mandate. The objectives of this program are to improve personal competency levels and self image, to raise academic and achievement levels, and to provide the OE retarded readers with increased diagnostic and corrective services. The emphasis of this evaluation report is on a quantitative and qualitative assessment of additional personnel and services, corrective reading and guidance services, and successful activities as determined by principals and district superintendents. Questionnaires, personal interviews, and observations were used in the evaluation. Appendixes include descriptions of district projects and goals, and copies of questionnaires and interview guides used. (KG)

5

ED038444

E008e

Project No. 1269

OPEN ENROLLMENT

by Colleen Stewart,
David J. Fox, and
Lois Steinberg

October 1969

Evaluation of
ESEA Title I Projects
in New York City
1968-69

UD009834E

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

The Center for Urban Education
105 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. 10016

ED038444

Center for Urban Education
Educational Research Committee
ESEA Title I Program Evaluation

OPEN ENROLLMENT: SERVICES TO CHILDREN IN RECEIVING ELEMENTARY, INTERMEDIATE AND JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS, AND ACADEMIC HIGH SCHOOLS

Colleen Stewart, David J. Fox, and Lois Steinberg

UD 009834 E

Evaluation of a New York City school district educational project funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (PL 89-10), performed under contract with the Board of Education of the City of New York for the 1968-69 school year.

November 1969

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The evaluation staff wishes to express its sincere thanks to all principals, teachers, and district office personnel who participated in this evaluation. These people willingly gave up valuable time answering questionnaires and assisting in setting up and carrying out observations of on-going activities.

The staff also appreciates the assistance given by the Office of Educational Research, of the New York City Board of Education, making available data on school utilization and ethnic composition of school populations.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Topic	Page
I	Introduction	1
II	Evaluation Procedures	4
III	The Provision of Additional Personnel and Services	11
IV	Corrective Reading Services	27
V	Guidance Services	49
VI	OE Receiving Schools: Utilization Rates and Ethnic Distribution	64
VII	Conclusions and Recommendations	75
	Appendix A-District Program Goals	A1
	Appendix B-Instruments	B1
	Appendix C-Field Observations of Some Successful Programs as Determined by Principals and District Office Personnel	C1
	Appendix D-Staff List	D1

Introduction to the Introduction

The 1968-69 recycling of the Open Enrollment program differed from previous cycles of the program in two significant respects. First, the program was decentralized so that instead of one program proposal prepared by central program staff, separate proposals were developed in eighteen districts receiving children under the program. Second, the program was expanded to include children who were bused upon the "free choice" of their parents and children who were bused through school transfers mandated to improve utilization of school facilities and further integration.

In the report which follows no distinction is made between the two programs grouped under the heading of Open Enrollment. This is because in the receiving schools no such distinction was made and it was not possible to discuss programs, services or pupil responses separately for the "free choice" children and the mandated transfer children. For educationally sound reasons district and school staff made clear that they did not consider the children as two separate groups nor did they make any effort to identify the source of the child's admission to the school.

But the two differences, decentralization and the inclusion of mandated transfers within the program, pose a problem for the reader attempting to develop continuity between this evaluation and earlier evaluations of the Free-Choice Open Enrollment program. The reader must realize that in two critical respects the 1968-69 program was different and comparison with previous years is therefore limited.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In September 1968 the Open Enrollment (OE) program conducted by the New York City Board of Education began its ninth year of operation. This program is designed to promote quality integrated education through services provided to students at the elementary, junior high, and senior high school levels. Although the OE program initially allowed the parents of minority group children to choose whether or not to transfer their children to predominantly white schools, this program now includes minority group students who were transferred to predominantly white schools through Board of Education mandate.[1]

The formal proposal submitted to the State Education Department by the New York City Board of Education listed the following program objectives: 1. to raise academic achievement and aspirational levels; 2. to improve personal competency levels and self image; 3. to provide the OE retarded readers with increased diagnostic and corrective services. Intensive instructional programs, small classes, and guidance and clinical services were the proposed procedures by which the aforementioned objectives were to be met.

---

[1] The New York City Board of Education states: "Two special programs are related to integration and utilization. Free Choice - Open Enrollment, in grades K-4 and including siblings, permits minority group pupils in schools having a large register of minority group pupils to transfer to other schools where there are few minority group pupils and where there is room. Under School Utilization, the same arrangement applies to schools where there are majority group pupils. Here in the interest of best utilization, pupils on any school level may be transferred from over-utilized schools to under-utilized schools. Free bus transportation is provided where necessary for pupils participating in these programs." (Facts and Figures, 1968-69, New York City Schools, City School District of New York, Central Headquarters, 110 Livingston Street, Brooklyn, New York 11201, p.13.)

The 1968-69 OE program activities were developed on a decentralized school district basis with 21 school districts submitting project proposals for the 1968-69 school year, aimed at meeting the specific needs of the OE children in their area. Allocations were made to each eligible district superintendent based upon the estimated number of poverty area children attending "receiving" schools in the district.

Based on federal and state guide lines, the proposals were designed: 1. to reflect efforts to foster integration and avoid or eliminate racial, social or linguistic isolation of children; and 2. to reflect the efforts to deal effectively with the educational deprivation of the OE children.

Although no one program included all the nine goals below, in general the district programs designed to meet the needs of the target population indicated an intent to concentrate on the following activities:[2]

1. Remedial reading
2. Remedial math
3. Guidance services
4. Recruitment of personnel from "sending communities for bus supervision and to serve as liaison between "sending" and "receiving" neighborhoods
5. Provision of bus service for "sending" school parents to facilitate parent involvement and workshops in "receiving" schools
6. Establishment of evening guidance and attendance services for the target population
7. Provision of multi-ethnic materials and supplies

---

[2] Appendix A contains summary descriptions of the program goals of each of the 21 districts participating in the 1968-69 Open Enrollment Program.

8. Provision of cultural experiences to improve self-image; and exposure of faculties, parents, and students to approaches in intergroup and integration activities

9. Improvement of skills of professional and paraprofessional staff

CHAPTER II

EVALUATION PROCEDURES

This is the fourth annual evaluation of the OE program. The 1967-68 evaluation reinforced two findings from previous evaluations which are specifically related to the objectives as stated by the Board of Education for the 1968-69 program. First, the 1967-68 data indicated that for the third consecutive year OE and resident children had positive perceptions towards themselves and their school. Three different samples and three different paper and pencil instruments as well as face to face interviews produced data which challenges the notion that minority group children have negatively oriented perceptions of themselves.

Secondly, the 1967-68 achievement data indicated for the third time that the OE child was characterized by severe reading retardation. However, the data showed that larger proportions of OE children were reading at or above grade level than in previous years.

In view of the consistency of the findings relating to achievement and self image these aspects of the program were not the focus of the assessment in this current evaluation effort. Instead, it was decided to concentrate on the level of services provided in the areas of reading and guidance.

The 1968-69 evaluation design consisted of a quantitative and qualitative assessment of the level of effort on the part of the participating schools. Four areas were the target of concentration:

1. Additional personnel and services
2. Corrective reading services
3. Guidance services
4. Successful activities as determined by principals and district superintendents

A series of questionnaires, personal interviews, and observations were conducted to implement this assessment. The following section of the report explains the specific objectives for which these procedures were used. (Copies of all instruments mentioned in this report are contained in Appendix B.)

A. OBJECTIVES AND PROCEDURES

1. Additional Personnel and Services

Two questionnaires were sent to the principals of schools participating in the OE program. Schedule "A" of the Project Application listed 129 elementary schools, 46 junior high and intermediate schools, and 13 high schools in the program. One questionnaire was sent at the beginning of the evaluation to all "receiving" school principals requesting information pertaining to the provision of additional personnel and services. An identical follow-up questionnaire was sent to those principals who did not respond within a reasonable length of time.

This phase of the evaluation sought to determine: the number of professional and paraprofessional positions allocated and how early they were filled, the number of children served, and the kind of educational materials and supplies provided.

A second questionnaire was sent to the majority of "receiving" school principals toward the end of the evaluation. Questionnaires were not sent to a small number of those principals who had been chosen for the sample for personal interviews. This questionnaire was designed to determine the principals' opinions as to the benefits and shortcomings of the OE program.

In an attempt to compare the type and quality of data obtained from mailed questionnaires to that received from personal interviews, a small sample of principals were interviewed. Principals to be interviewed were chosen from five districts which represented large, medium, and small districts based on the total Title I budget, the total district register, and the reported number of OE pupils in the district. In addition, the principals in the district had indicated that they had received "additional" personnel for the OE program. The five district proposals also indicated that a variety of approaches would be used to implement the proposed programs. The same structured questionnaire was used for both the personal interviews and the mailed survey. There were no substantive differences in the data obtained from the two samples.

2. Corrective Reading Services

This feature of the evaluation was undertaken in order to determine the quantity and quality of skill training for professional and paraprofessional personnel; the impressions and opinions of personnel and staff responsible for implementing district proposals; the quality and quantity of instruction and services; the size of instructional groups; and the quality and quantity of multi-ethnic materials and supplies.

Four separate aspects constituted this stage of the evaluation:

1. Interviews with district reading supervisors
2. Observations of corrective reading classes
3. Interviews with corrective reading teachers
4. Interviews with classroom teachers of Open Enrollment children receiving corrective reading instruction

a. Interviews with Reading Supervisors

District reading supervisors were interviewed by a staff member of the evaluation team at the district offices. A structured interview guide was used in an attempt to ascertain the supervisors' familiarity with and understanding of their districts' Open Enrollment proposal. In addition, they were questioned about skill training sessions and supervision for professional and paraprofessional personnel. Finally, these supervisors were asked for their opinions of the Open Enrollment program and for their recommendations for future programs.

b. Observations of Corrective Reading Classes

Corrective reading classes in a total of 41 schools (105 classes) were observed by a team of ten reading specialists and educators. The observers worked singly and observed at least two corrective reading classes in most of the 41 schools.

Schools were selected for observational visits on the basis of matching the availability of the observers with the schedules for the corrective reading activities in the various schools.

The Individual Lesson Observation Report was adapted from similar instruments used in previous OE and MES evaluations.[1]

---

[1] The ILOR and its characteristics are fully discussed in More Effective Schools, by David J. Fox, Center for Urban Education, September 1967.

The ILOR was designed to ascertain the qualitative and quantitative functioning of both the teachers and pupils in the corrective reading classes. In addition, the ILOR was designed to yield data on the quality and quantity of materials and supplies used in these classes and on the physical setting in which these classes were held.[2]

c. Interviews with Corrective Reading and Classroom Teachers

In addition to the classroom observations in each of the 41 participating schools, the reading teachers and at least two classroom teachers of Open Enrollment children answered questionnaires. Where teachers had the time, they were interviewed, otherwise the questionnaire was self-administered.

The instruments used in this part of the evaluation were structured questionnaires for corrective reading teachers and classroom teachers. The teacher questionnaires were nearly identical and had a four-fold purpose:

1. To determine the amount of coordination of the corrective reading instruction with classroom instruction[3]

---

[2] Mary C. Austin and Coleman Morrison, "Services for Children with Reading Difficulties," in Remedial Reading: An Anthology of Sources, Leo M. Schell and Paul C. Burns, eds., Boston, Allyn and Bacon Inc., 1968, p. 12. Austin and Morrison found in their study that one reason given for not hiring additional reading personnel was lack of space. They mentioned cases where reading classes were being conducted in corridors, storerooms, and the custodian's workshop.

[3] Ibid, p. 11-12. Austin and Morrison found in a study of 795 school systems that one of the major causes of dissatisfaction with remedial programs and personnel was the lack of communication among principals, classroom teachers and reading teachers: "While the reading teachers claimed that principals and teachers resisted their suggestions and attempts to coordinate the corrective and regular classroom programs, principals and teachers complained that the remedial teacher frequently tried to gear the schools' entire program to that of the reading center."

2. To determine the educational background and training of the teachers[4]

3. To obtain the teachers' impressions of the OE program and of the children participating in the program

4. To determine the criteria for referral to corrective reading classes

3. Guidance Services

Guidance coordinators, in those districts which had indicated in their proposal an intention to provide guidance services to OE children, were interviewed by a staff member. These interviews, like those with the reading supervisors, were designed to elicit specific information regarding the guidance services in the guidance coordinators' district schools. A structured interview guide was used to obtain such information as: the coordinators' familiarity and understanding of the district proposal; skill sessions held or planned for professional personnel; supervision of personnel; and the coordinators' opinions of the OE program and their recommendations for future programs.

Another phase of this aspect of the evaluation was personal interviews with at least a 35 percent sample of the counselors who had been specified "additional personnel" by the principals on the first questionnaire sent to them. Counselors were chosen from as many districts as possible. The purpose of these interviews was to determine:

1. The extent to which the OE children were served by the program

2. The types of guidance services offered

---

[4] Ibid, p.11. Austin and Morrison also found that another criticism of special reading programs was the scarcity of competent special reading personnel.

3. The reasons OE children were referred and the causes of their problems

4. The type of supervision received by the guidance counselors

5. The educational background of the guidance counselors

6. The opinions of the guidance counselors as to the adequacy of the program and problems encountered in attempting to implement the program

4. Successful Activities

Another phase of the evaluation design sought to describe successful aspects of the OE program. Letters were sent to district superintendents and principals of the participating districts asking them to indicate on the form provided those practices which they felt had been particularly successful. Based on these reports, observations were made in schools and district offices. The observation team was composed of one sociologist, two educators who are teacher trainers, and one instructional materials specialist. Their observations appear in Appendix C.

CHAPTER III

THE PROVISION OF ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL AND SERVICES

A. INTRODUCTION

The data presented in this section are based on the answers to two questionnaires by the principals of the schools participating in the Open Enrollment program. The first questionnaire was sent to the principals at the beginning of the school semester to determine:

1. The number of professional and paraprofessional positions allocated
2. The difficulties in filling these positions
3. The number of children served by the program
4. The variety of multi-ethnic materials and supplies

A total of 170 principals (90 percent) returned the first questionnaire.

About midterm during the semester, a second questionnaire was completed by 88 principals (47 percent of all schools involved). This group of principals represented 19 of the 21 districts submitting proposals. This questionnaire was designed to ascertain the principals' perceptions of the adequacy of the receiving schools to meet the needs of both the OE children and the resident children. The questionnaire items were concerned with:

1. The adequacy of corrective reading and guidance services
2. The adequacy of teacher training in the teaching of reading
3. Activities for OE parents
4. The level of performance of paraprofessional personnel
5. The principals' opinions of the worth of the OE program

The findings and the discussion of both questionnaires are presented under the following headings:

1. The Quantitative and Qualitative Assessment of Professional and Paraprofessional Positions
2. The Quantitative and Qualitative Assessment of Multi-Ethnic Materials and Supplies
3. The Children Served
4. Parent Involvement and Community Response

B. THE QUANTITATIVE ASSESSMENT OF PROFESSIONAL AND PARAPROFESSIONAL POSITIONS

1. The Number of Allocated Positions

Table III-1 and III-2 give a comparison of the number of positions proposed and what was reported as received by the responding principals.

In Table III-1 the total number of professional personnel reported received by the principals is nearly identical with the number proposed. The number of corrective reading teachers reported received exceeeds the number proposed (by 33) but this was ostensibly compensated for by a drop of 34 in the number of classroom teachers. This might suggest that principals preferred to use the positions for corrective reading rather than to form new classes. The number of guidance counselors reported received exceeds the number proposed by two. Keeping in mind that ten percent of the involved schools did not respond to the questionnaire and that some of those which did respond claimed not to be Open Enrollment schools,these data would indicate a general correlation between intent and implementation.

However, the data must be interpreted with caution, particularly in concluding that many new positions were provided. First, many

TABLE III-1

ADDITIONAL PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL PROPOSED BY DISTRICT PROPOSALS AND REPORTED AS RECEIVED BY PRINCIPALS OF PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS

Type of Personnel	Number Proposed[a]	Number Reported
Corrective reading teachers	48.5	81.9
Regular classroom teachers	63.0	19.0
Other teachers:		
Enrichment	10.5	19.5
Bi-lingual	1.0	1.0
Teachers of English as a second language	1.0	3.0
Industrial arts	0.0	1.0
Home economics	0.0	1.0
Quota	0.0	1.0
Attendance	1.0	0.0
Speech	1.0	1.0
Guidance counselors	60.5	62.6
Social workers	4.0	1.0
School psychologists	1.0	1.0
Teacher trainers	2.0	0.0
	193.5	193.0

---

[a] These figures were taken from the Personal Service Worksheets for each district. The following positions were counted above in whole numbers but budgeted as part-time: 13 corrective reading, 6 regular teaching, 13 guidance, 4 social workers, and 1 psychologist.

principals and/or school clerks simply were not aware of the specific budget which accounts for specific personnel. Second, a number of principals indicated that they had simply designated regularly assigned teachers in their schools as ESEA Title I teachers or guidance counselors and had not actually received any new or additional personnel. This is illustrated by information gained from interviews with guidance counselors. Of the 38 counselors who answered a question on experience, 58 percent indicated that they had been in their school from three to more than 20 years and in the school as a guidance counselor from two to ten years. The other 42 percent represented those who could have been hired for the program. Confusion among staff as to which program related to a specific budget line made it difficult to be more precise.

Another reason for questioning the data is the fact that 35 junior high schools listed as part of the Open Enrollment program were also listed as participants of another ESEA Title I program, the Project to Improve Academic Achievement Among Poverty Area Schools. These 35 schools accounted for 31.6 of the professional personnel reported received for the Open Enrollment evaluation. However, when attempting to make appointments for observational visits, there was gross confusion about the program to which we were referring. The principal of one of these 35 schools sent a letter to the evaluation office stating that they recorded no OE children since they had been rezoned and all of the children in the school were considered to be in the district. The Title I coordinator for the district was contacted and the principal subsequently returned the questionnaire indicating that he had received 1 corrective reading teacher, 2 guidance counselors, and 3 family assistants. In addition, three of these schools indicated that they were not involved in the OE program although they were listed as having 516, 387, and 54 Open Enrollment students in attendance at their schools.

While there may be nothing wrong with budgeting regularly assigned teachers to new budgets when they might easily become excess personnel on other budgets, this practice is not providing "compensatory" education for the children for whom it was expressly designed. The fact that some schools were involved in more than one Title I program is not at question either. However, in order to conduct meaningful assessments of these programs some way must be found to separate them, or more intimate knowledge of their operation must be made available.

The data contained in Table III-2 indicate that far fewer paraprofessionals (38 percent fewer) were reported received than had been proposed. The concept of using people from the "sending" school community is a sound one. However, it was pointed out by several principals that because of the difficulties of travel and the low pay many people who might have been recruited were not available. In several instances the principals stated that they had been obliged to use people from the "receiving" school community.

While the Board of Education's Memo to District Superintendents and Unit Administrators pointed out that secretarial and clerical positions are not allowed because of Federal guidelines, nevertheless, six such positions were budgeted in district proposals. However, none of these positions was reported filled.

TABLE III-2

ADDITIONAL NON-PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL PROPOSED BY DISTRICT PROPOSALS AND REPORTED AS RECEIVED BY PRINCIPALS OF PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS[a]

Type of Personnel	Number Proposed	Number Received
Educational assistants	54	10
Family assistants	21	13
School aides	133	111
Secretarial and clerical	6	0
Paraprofessional trainer	1	0
	215	134

---

[a] These data are the result of responses to the first questionnaire which yielded a 90 percent response.

2. Adequacy of Staff to Meet Student Needs

Principals were asked to respond to the question as to the extent to which their staff was adequate to meet the needs of the children in their schools. This was part of the second questionnaire and for those responding the data are presented in Table III-3.

TABLE III-3

THE ADEQUACY OF THE STAFF TO MEET THE NEEDS OF ALL CHILDREN AS COMPARED TO OE CHILDREN AS PERCEIVED BY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

	To Meet Needs of All Children				To Meet Needs of OE Children			
Staff Adequacy	Elementary		Junior High	High School	Elementary		Junior High	High School
	N= 58	Percent	N=22	N=8	N=56	Percent	N=22	N=7
Fully Adequate	7	12	1	1	6	11	0	1
Adequate, but not fully adequate	49	84	19	7	47	84	19	2
Inadequate	2	4	2	0	3	5	3	4

These data indicate that the majority of all principals felt that while their staff was adequate it could not fully meet the needs of the children. At the elementary and junior high levels principals evaluated their ability to meet the needs of OE children in the same way as they did "all children." However, where no high school principal felt his staff inadequate to meet the needs of "all children," four of seven high school principals felt the staff was "inadequate to meet the needs of the OE children."

It should be noted that the proposed additional personnel for junior and intermediate schools and high schools was limited. District proposals specified the following personnel for 25 of 46 junior high schools listed on the project register: 15 corrective reading teachers; 14 guidance counselors; three regular teachers; and one bi-lingual social worker. The following personnel was specified for seven of 13 high schools listed on the project register: four guidance counselors and 13 regular teachers.

3. Adequacy of Guidance Services

The principals were asked to define the role of the guidance counselor as they perceived it. Table III-4 presents these data. The majority of the junior high and high school principals defined this role as one which should emphasize individual counseling. However, half of the elementary principals perceived of this role as one which should place the major emphasis on referrals and intra-school and inter-school articulation.

TABLE III-4

THE ROLE OF THE GUIDANCE COUNSELOR AS PERCEIVED BY PRINCIPALS

Role Emphasis	Elementary Principals N=49	Junior High Principals N=20	High School Principals N=5
Individual Counseling	24	12	4
Referral and Intro-and Inter-School Articulation	25	8	1

The principals were also asked to indicate the extent to which their guidance staffs were able to fulfill the role as they perceived it. These data are presented in Table III-5. The majority of all principals indicated that although the role had not been fully fulfilled by their guidance staffs it had been fulfilled "generally" or "somewhat."

TABLE III-5

THE EXTENT TO WHICH GUIDANCE STAFF ABLE TO FULFILL ROLE AS PERCEIVED BY PRINCIPALS

Ability to Fulfill Role	Elementary Principals N=53	Junior High Principals N=21	High School Principals N=6
Fully	9	2	0
Generally or somewhat but not fully	39	13	6
Very little	5	6	0

4. The Qualitative Assessment of Professional and Paraprofessional Personnel

a. The adequacy of Teacher Training

According to the experiences of receiving school principals there seems to be a need for restructuring teacher training programs, particularly in relation to the teaching of reading in regular classes. A very small minority (7 percent) of the principal sample had no suggestions for improved teacher training, since all or most of their teachers were very experienced. Of the 82 principals responding to this question, 60 percent indicated a need for "more practical preparation in basic reading skills" at the college level. "In-service courses" were recommended by 34 percent and 20 percent suggested that trainees needed "more practice teaching" experience. Five percent suggested an "apprenticeship program" before assuming full-time teaching positions. An equal number (5 percent) of references were made to a "need to teach methods of diagnosis and remediation."

In-service courses are conducted in most schools to help teachers improve their skills in the teaching of reading. Eighty-six percent of the 83 principals responding to this item mentioned this factor. Four principals (6 percent) said that the corrective reading teacher helped classroom teachers as the only form of assistance. Only two principals (3 percent) said that nothing was done to assist teachers, primarily because no one in the school had the time.

The principals who were personally interviewed expressed a degree of resignation in replying to the question relating to teacher training. "Teachers have always been poorly trained," in the opinion of one junior high school principal with over 20 years of experience in this position. "Colleges should hire people from schools to teach future teachers. Teachers need a structured pattern. The program has to be geared to the average teacher," he added. A similar view was expressed by an equally experienced elementary school principal: "Teachers need a cook-book approach until they have more experience. They say that this stifles initiative and creativity but from where I sit they (teachers) don't have these qualities."

Another elementary principal commented: "Teachers often know nothing about reading and classroom management. You need college teachers who have had experience. They are totally unaware of our problems. Some are unsympathetic...too theoretical."

b. The Assessment of Paraprofessionals

The small number of schools in the sample[1] who reported receiving paraprofessionals make it difficult to assess this phase of the Open Enrollment program. There were only 12 schools with family workers, 14 with educational aides, and 12 with educational assistants. Most of these employees were rated as "excellent" or "good" by their principals. Several principals who were interviewed noted that they were unable to tell if the paraprofessionals were funded through Open Enrollment or other programs.

5. The Quantitative and Qualitative Assessment of Supplies and Multi-Ethnic Materials

a. The Quantitative Assessment of Supplies

The majority of the 51 principals who answered the question relating to the provision of additional supplies and materials indicated that they had requested and received a variety of materials and supplies. The most frequently mentioned items were textbooks, audio-visual materials, library books, and workbooks. Table III-6 presents these data.

---

[1] These data were obtained from the second principal's questionnaire which resulted in a 47 percent response as contrasted to a 90 percent response to the first questionnaire. It should also be noted that data from the first questionnaire showed only ten educational assistants received, whereas 12 are reported in this sample. This is an illustration of the difficulties encountered in trying to account for personnel received as a result of the OE program.

TABLE III-6

SUPPLIES REQUESTED AND RECEIVED AS REPORTED BY PRINCIPALS IN ORDER OF FREQUENCY OF MENTION
N=51

Type of Supplies	Number of Mentions
Textbooks	41
Workbooks	24
Miscellaneous (money, furniture, office and general supplies, postage)	22
Audiovisual materials	20
Teaching aids	17
Library books	15
Games	7

b. The Qualitative Assessment of Multi-Ethnic Materials

Ninety-three percent of the principals reported that their schools were using multi-ethnic materials and most said they were used with Open Enrollment and resident pupils. Principal evaluation of these materials varied. They were reported to be "excellent" or "good" by 31 percent, and "average" or "fair" by 15 percent of the 73 principals who responded to this question. Twenty percent felt it was difficult to measure the quality of the materials. The other third were not enthusiastic about these materials and some of the principals interviewed explained that the materials were inappropriate for the type of Open Enrollment pupil in their school. "The resident homes may be a little bit nicer than theirs, but most of our Open Enrollees come from professional families with well-kept houses. There are no garbage cans on their streets," observed one elementary school principal. Another offered the view that, "it's the teacher, not the material, which is of prime importance."

C. THE NUMBER OF CHILDREN SERVED

According to the formal proposal a total of 31,471 Open Enrollment children were to be served: 14,485 at the elementary level, 10,218 at the junior high level, and 6,768 at the senior high school level. These figures were taken from the project register and are slightly higher than the "unduplicated count" of 31,356 cited in page one of the project proposal.

These totals did not include one district whose proposal was received by the Board of Education too late to be included.

To assess the number of children actually served, the questionnaires to the participating school principals requested them to indicate the total number of Open Enrollment children in their schools. Although nearly half of the principals answered this question, there was little or no correlation between the figures given for the individual schools and the figures contained in the formal proposal for those schools. This inconsistency can most likely be attributed to differences resulting from including in their count all out-of-district children, i.e. mandated transfers and free-choice open enrollment children.

1. Effect of Open Enrollment on Resident Pupils

To see if principals perceived any effect of the OE program on resident pupils, they were asked to identify effects in five areas:

attendance, reading, arithmetic, motivation and behavior. Of the 42 responding, few principals perceived any negative or positive effects on resident children in any area. Only three principals felt resident attendance had been affected. A loss in reading instruction for residents was seen by 12 principals (13 percent), ten of whom were elementary school principals.

A loss in arithmetic instruction for resident pupils was felt by seven principals (8 percent). Five principals saw some effect on motivation (6 percent) and 19 (22 percent) felt Open Enrollment had a negative effect on behavior. Most often they expressed the view that Open Enrollment children had changed the "tone" of the school, with resident pupils becoming less compliant.

Effects were usually, but not always, expressed negatively. For example, one principal said that "the resident children have become more tolerant of deviations from what they had known." Another principal felt that the presence of Open Enrollment pupils had made the school more "lively."

According to information obtained in interviews, principals have no objective data other than their school's average reading score on which to base their opinions relating to the effect of Open Enrollment.[2] Only one principal reported conducting an evaluation of the effect of the program, and this was based on teachers' subjective views. In this same connection, it should be noted that no principal indicated having made an effort to evaluate the effect of the program on Open Enrollment pupils and more referred to the previous evaluations of the program.

---

[2] It is relevant here to note that the 1967-68 evaluation indicated that resident children in a sample of OE receiving schools had higher reading grades, on the average, than children in these schools before Open Enrollment.

D. PARENT INVOLVEMENT AND COMMUNITY RESPONSE

1. Involvement of OE Parents

Although 89 percent of the principals indicated that they had done specific things to bring Open Enrollment parents into communication with teachers and other parents, when asked to describe these activities they were most often described as routine activities. Table III-7 presents these data. However, both elementary and junior high school principals indicated that they were almost as likely to issue special invitations to Open Enrollment parents for these routine school activities. The indications of activities in the sending schools is a beginning in a direction where the need has been established in earlier evaluations.

TABLE III-7

ACTIVITIES CONDUCTED TO BRING OPEN ENROLLMENT PARENTS INTO COMMUNICATION WITH TEACHERS AND RESIDENT PARENTS (IN ORDER OF FREQUENCY OF MENTION)

Activity	Elementary Schools	Junior High Schools	High Schools	Total
Routine invitations to school activities	18	8	4	30
Special invitations to OE parents for routine school activities	16	6	0	22
Special workshops and/or meetings for OE parents in receiving school	9	2	0	11
Special meetings for OE parents in sending school area	7	1	2	10
Conferences, letters, and phone calls	2	2	14	18

2. Assessment of Community Response to Open Enrollment

Based on the principals' perceptions of community response (82 percent), almost three-fourths of the communities represented by this sample welcomed Open Enrollment children. Of this group, 22 percent of the principals reported "completely favorable" reception and 51 percent reported a "generally favorable" or "mixed" response. However, 20 percent of the principals observed a "completely negative" community response. A small number (7 percent) indicated that the negligible number of Open Enrollment children in their school had evoked no community response. Answers coded as "generally favorable" were those indicating a favorable attitude in a majority of parents but antagonism expressed by a small minority. These negative comments usually referred to social factors: complaints about a specific incident or discipline problems which parents attributed to Open Enrollment children.

Several principals indicated a change in community attitude since the strike. According to one, the community response was "originally positive" although "parents were not so keen on Open Enrollment in individual cases." Since the strike, "there is a change in resident parents and Open Enrollment Children. Some resident parents are reported to be more 'fearful of incidents' and some Open Enrollment children are 'exhibiting hostility' toward school personnel."

CHAPTER IV

CORRECTIVE READING SERVICES

A. INTRODUCTION

Several district proposals indicated the intention to concentrate on providing corrective reading services to OE children. This phase of the evaluation directs itself to the qualitative and quantitative dimensions of these services.

The findings reported here are a result of interviews with District Reading Coordinators, observations of corrective reading classes, and questionnaires filled in by corrective reading teachers and classroom teachers who had OE pupils in their classes. The findings and discussion which follow will be presented under the following headings:

1. Qualitative assessment
2. Quantitative assessment
3. Assessment of Program Objectives

In-depth interviews were conducted with twelve reading coordinators in order to obtain information which would aid in developing appropriate instruments for the other areas to be assessed. Reading services were mentioned in 19 of the 20 district proposals available to the evaluation team at the time this activity was being carried on. One district proposal was received too late to be included in this phase of the evaluation.

Appointments were scheduled with twelve reading coordinators and interviews were conducted between March 19, 1969 and April 14, 1969.

A total of 50 corrective reading teachers and 163 classroom teachers responded to the questionnaire. Teachers at the elementary, junior high, and high school level participated. Differences in response patterns at the elementary and junior high school level will be noted in the text. Otherwise data will be discussed across school level.

B. QUALITATIVE ASSESSMENT OF CORRECTIVE READING SERVICES

1. Identification and Method of Selection of OE Students for Corrective Reading Classes

The interviews with the reading coordinators indicated that the Open Enrollment pupils were selected for corrective reading instruction on the same basis as other children. That is, those children were selected who scored two years or more below grade level on standardized or informal open book tests, with the classroom teacher most often making the recommendation. The data obtained from the corrective teacher questionnaires confirmed this in part. They most often (39 percent) checked the "classroom teacher" as the principal source of referrals and checked "other"(33 percent of time) next in order of frequency. The principal was checked 18 percent of the time and the school psychologist ten percent of the time. An examination of who the "other" sources were indicated that referrals were often made as a result of conferences including the principal and/or the corrective reading teacher, the guidance counselor, and the classroom teacher. Many coordinators indicated that the Open Enrollment students were selected on the same basis as other children: scores on standardized tests, past performance, and informal textbook tests. Teachers did not give the amount of retardation which was required before a child was placed in a corrective reading group but indicated that those who were "most" retarded were selected. Seven out of 12 reading coordinators indicated that their district's corrective reading teachers were shared equally by OE and resident pupils. Observers of classroom instruction were asked to note the times that classes contained more resident than OE students, and this was noted in six out of the 105 observations. However, a number of times observers mentioned other reading programs which they were told about by the corrective teacher which did not service any OE children.

2. Diagnostic Testing

The statement made by the majority of the reading coordinators that diagnostic testing was not done was not confirmed by the corrective reading teachers. Eighty-three percent of the teachers stated that diagnostic testing was done; however, when asked to name those tests used, the majority who did so named the Metropolitan Achievement Test, a group test of achievement and not diagnostic in nature. There was negligible mention of such tests as the Gray Oral Reading Tests, the Spache Diagnostic Reading Scales, Durell's Analysis of Reading Difficulty, or the Gates-McKillop Reading Diagnostic Tests. Thus the lack of genuine diagnostic testing, noted in the 1967-68 evaluation persists.

C. ASSESSMENT OF INSTRUCTION

1. Frequency and Coordination of Instruction

The reading coordinators indicated that instruction in corrective reading classes took place two times per week in groups ranging from eight to ten pupils. This was confirmed by the observers in discussion with teachers and by the data from the first principals' questionnaire. In only one instance was it noted by the observer that the corrective reading teacher met the group every day.

Like the reading coordinators, the corrective reading teachers and the classroom teachers apparently felt that the coordination of classroom instruction and corrective reading instruction was important. Both kinds of teachers agreed there was a consistent relationship between both types of instruction. The largest number of both classroom teachers (35 percent) and corrective reading teachers (41 percent) felt that the relationship was "highly consistent" and the second largest group that it was "somewhat consistent" (30 percent of the classroom teachers and 22 percent of the corrective reading teachers). Only one in six in the two groups of teachers (16 percent of the classroom teachers and 17 percent of the corrective reading teachers) felt that there was "inconsistency" in the relationship.

More than half of each group (57 percent each) said they consulted with each other from twice a month to once a week. Otherwise they reported having consultations with each other "whenever the need arose." These consultations might take place in the lunchroom, the teachers' room, or spontaneously in the hall. There was some disagreement, however, between the two groups as to the topics of their discussions. With both groups of teachers their "concern for pupil progress" was indicated most often as the topic of discussions. However, the corrective reading teachers indicated an equal concern for the "selection of appropriate materials" for the children in the corrective classes; with the classroom teachers this was of second importance. Both found that they discussed "ways to relate remedial instruction to classroom instruction" less often than the other two topics, and that "seeking or offering suggestions for helping pupils not receiving remedial instruction," was least often discussed.

2. Class Size and Absenteeism

A total of 105 corrective reading classes were observed during the course of the evaluation, and provide the basis for this section on class size, attendance and instructional procedures.

The size of the groups observed ranged from one to 33. The breakdown according to scholastic level is presented in Table IV-1. These data show that most often classes were composed of eight children at the elementary level, five children at the junior high school level, and 13 at the high school level. The data relating to absenteeism indicate that at the elementary school level the class size observed was a relatively true representation of register, for almost all (86 percent) of the corrective reading teachers reported that no more than one child was absent on the day of the observation. However, at the junior high school level, the same majority (84 percent) of the teachers reported that two or more pupils were absent on the day of the observation, most often two (42 percent), but often three (17 percent) or five (17 percent). The three corrective reading classes at the high school level indicated considerably higher absenteeism. In one class twelve students were absent, in a second class

TABLE IV-I

SIZE OF CORRECTIVE READING GROUPS OBSERVED, BY SCHOOL LEVEL

Number of children in group	Elementary 89 classes	Junior High 13 classes	High School 3 classes
1	6	0	0
2 - 4	4	0	
5 - 6	11	5	
7 - 8	30	1	1
9 - 10	24	1	
11 - 15	12	4	2
16 - 20	0	1	
20 or more	2	1	
Range	1 to 23	5 to 33	8 to 13
Mode	8	5	13
Mean	8.3	10.1	11.2

20 students were absent, and in a third class 21 students were absent. The actual class size of these three groups would have been 20, 33, and 34 respectively had all children been present on the day of the observation.

The length of the lessons ranged from 15 minutes to 60 minutes with the large majority (78 percent) lasting 40 to 50 minutes. Only 14 percent ran for more than 50 minutes, and only eight percent for 30 minutes or less.

3. Instructional Procedures

A summary profile of the general classroom functioning would characterize the typical corrective reading class as composed of from five to 13 pupils, most likely one group, and with more than one activity during the class period. The average teacher was impartial to children of different levels of ability and got along well with most of the children. The lessons were described as most often well planned and appropriate for almost every child. The methods used by the corrective reading teacher were rated as providing for the development of a systematic sequence of skills for most of the children in the group. The typical classroom was described as primarily set up for corrective reading classes and was of average attractiveness with a disciplined yet congenial and warm group atmosphere. The lesson content was most likely phonics oriented combined with oral reading. The following section presents a more detailed evaluation of the instructional procedures.

a. Grouping

At the elementary school level the large majority (88 percent) of the 89 classes were taught as one group. There were seven classes divided into two groups and one class in which the children were divided into four groups for instructional purposes.

In the junior high schools, too, the majority (11 out of 13) of the classes were taught as one group with two classes reported as having divided the pupils into two groups. The three classes observed at the high school level were all taught as one group.

b. Teacher Impartiality

The observers reported that the great majority (90 percent) of the teachers did not seem partial to any of the children as a function of childrens' ability. This was true at both the elementary and junior high level. However, the observers reported that in two out of three high school classes observed, the teacher appeared partial to the less able students in the class.

c. Typicality of Classes

At all levels, the majority of the observers (87 percent) saw the entire lesson. Thirteen percent missed only the beginning of the lesson. The classes observed were considered "completely typical" 59 percent of the time and "a reasonable approximation" 36 percent of the time.

Thus lessons were rated atypical five percent of the time. Following are some explanations given for rating classes as atypical:

> "One group was on a trip, and only four children were left. The teacher asked them what they wanted to do and they wanted to read out loud."
>
> "The teacher called a special session for me to 'observe' for 25 minutes."
>
> "The teacher seemed to be conscious of my presence. The students seemed exceptionally tense and overpolite, as if they had been warned to behave in a certain way for the observation."

d. Planning by Teachers

Planning was evident and considered good. The team of observers rated one-fourth (23 percent) of the teachers as showing that they had done "exceptional" planning for their lessons and one-third (36 percent) as having planned "well." Teachers were rated as having shown "some evidence" of planning 31 percent of the time. At the elementary school level ten percent of the teachers were rated as having shown "few or no signs" of planning, whereas at the junior high level no lessons were judged to be in this category.

e. Lesson Content and Materials

The lesson content of the reading classes was rated as "appropriate for every or almost every child" most (62 percent) of the time; for "more than half" the group 20 percent of the time; and "appropriate for none of the children" 2 percent of the time.

The observers found the materials used in the classroom related to the child's particular deficiency (78 percent). When the materials were not considered related (22 percent) it was because no diagnostic materials were available or used, skills were taught in isolation, and the work was not individualized. Not only were the materials considered related, but they were also rated as providing motivation to read either for "all or almost every pupil" (62 percent) or for "half or more than half" (23 percent). Table IV-2 shows the frequency of mention for materials used or displayed in the classroom. According to these data the elementary corrective reading classroom was most likely to display or have in use skill workbooks, picture cards, basal readers, reading games and basal reader workbooks. The junior high school classroom was most likely to display or have in use trade books, picture cards, skill workbooks, basal readers, and basal reader workbooks. The three high school classes displayed, or had in use, skill workbooks and a quick flash device.

Materials were not well displayed in the corrective reading classes for the rating "exceptionally interesting" was given only 32 percent of the time. Otherwise materials were considered "displayed but not in a provocative manner" (48 percent) or "poorly displayed" (5 percent) with no materials displayed 15 percent of the time.

f. Teaching methods

The methods employed were rated to be such that they would provide for the development of a systematic sequence of skills for "almost every child" (74 percent). Only at the elementary school level were they ever rated as providing no systematic sequence of skills (13 percent). As to the extent to which corrective reading lessons referred

TABLE IV-2

MATERIALS USED OR DISPLAYED IN THE CORRECTIVE READING CLASSROOM
(Frequency of Mention by Observers)

Type of Material	Elementary Classroom N=89	Junior High Classroom N=13	High School Classroom N=3
Skill Workbooks	68	9	3
Picture Cards	65	10	0
Basic Readers	63	10	0
Reading Games	60	8	0
Basal Reader Workbooks	60	8	0
Tradebooks	39	11	0
Experiential Reading	33	8	0
Quick Flash Devices	18	6	1
Tape Recorders	4	6	0
Newspapers	3	6	0
Reading Laboratories	1	6	0
Pacers	1	5	0

to earlier class materials they did "some" (47 percent) or to a "considerable" extent (16 percent) of the time. However, in a substantial minority of classes (28 percent) the observers detected no reference to earlier class material. Corroborating this are the ratings indicating no reference to regular class work more than three-fourths of the time (81 percent), "some" reference 15 percent of the time, and "a great deal" of reference to regular class work only 4 percent of the time.

The corrective reading lessons were rated to have laid a foundation for future lessons to either "some" (53 percent) or a "considerable" degree (31 percent) but as affording "little or no possibility" for continuity 13 percent of the time. Most (79 percent) of the lessons laid a foundation for independent work, either to "some extent" (52 percent) or to a "considerable" extent (27 percent).

The observers were asked to judge the amount of material covered during the corrective reading classes, keeping in mind the fact that there had been a number of disruptions in the school year and that the program had been in effect less than three months. They felt it was "average" (48 percent) or better (40 percent). The depth of instruction too was rated "average" (36 percent) or better (54 percent). In two of three lessons (66 percent) "every or almost every" child was observed as having shown interest or enthusiasm and only rarely (5 percent) did "very few" of the children show interest and enthusiasm.

In about half of the lessons (48 percent) "every or almost every" child volunteered to the teacher's questions with "more than half" of the children volunteering 21 percent of the time. Only rarely (7 percent) were teachers rated as having asked few or no questions when the material lent itself to questioning, but the material was judged as not lending itself to questions 16 percent of the time.

The observers reported that fewer than half to "very few" children raised questions 41 percent of the time with half or more asking questions 9 percent of the time. On the other hand they reported that the material did not lend itself to children's questions 36 percent of the time. However, when the material or lesson made questioning possible, children asked few questions (14 percent).

When questions were asked they were welcomed and built upon three-fourths of the time (77 percent), answered cursorily 22 percent of the time and ignored 3 percent of the time.

"Every or almost every" child was actively involved in the classroom activities (72 percent), and the great majority of the children (88 percent) were rated as understanding the teacher's spoken word. Where there were non-English speaking children in the corrective reading classes the teachers were judged to have communicated with ease most (63 percent) of the time. Almost all of the teachers (93 percent) were rated as having good rapport with "all or almost all" of their pupils.

Evaluation of the children's work was included in 53 out of 105 lessons and when included was most likely to be "encouraging" or "positive," in terms of the criteria and supported by suggestions for improvement. Two-thirds (65 percent) of the teachers appeared to have "realistic" expectations for their pupils while 28 percent of them did not indicate any expectations for the children. The teachers made an attempt to praise "all or almost every pupil" two-thirds of the time (64 percent), but in one class in four the observer heard praise for only "a few" (13 percent) or "none" of the pupils (12 percent).

The overall quality of instruction was judged to be "better than average" (33 percent), "average" (39 percent), and "outstanding" in one class in five (19 percent). One class in 11, 9 percent of the classes, were rated as "below average" or "extremely poor."

The majority (81 percent) of the corrective reading classrooms had been set up primarily for corrective reading classes. In only 19 percent of the cases, they were not. The appearance of the classrooms in which the corrective reading classes were held were usually rated of "average" appearance (40 percent) or "better" (42 percent) with 13 percent rated as unattractive and five percent rated less than average.

The group atmosphere was described as "disciplined yet congenial and warm" most (69 percent) of the time, "undisciplined and warm" 17 percent of the time, and "overdisciplined yet warm" 5 percent of the time. The atmosphere was rated "cold and undisciplined" 3 percent of the time and "overdisciplined and cold" 2 percent of the time. Relating to the atmosphere, almost all (93 percent) of the children appeared relaxed with only a few classes (7 percent) appearing somewhat restrained to the observers. In no class were children reported to appear "inhibited."

Most of the observers who felt able to answer the question concerning the effect of participation in the class on the children's achievement felt that the greatest number would make slight progress.

4. Assessment of Professional Skill Training

The teachers were asked if they felt able to handle the educational needs of the Open Enrollment children. The majority of both groups (83 percent of the classroom teachers and 94 percent of the corrective reading teachers) responded affirmatively. Of these, 40 teachers cited the fact that their professional background and training had prepared them to handle the educational needs of the Open Enrollment child; also, of these 20 cited experience in disadvantaged areas; and 33 of the 40 mentioned that they had the ability to handle the needs of any child. It is interesting to note that of the 16 who felt that the needs of the Open Enrollment child were the same as any other child many qualified this to mean that the needs of the Open Enrollment child could be handled in the same manner if he didn't have any atypical problems.

Fifteen percent of the classroom teachers and 6 percent of the corrective reading teachers felt unable to handle the needs of the Open Enrollment child. The most frequently cited reason for this feeling of inadequacy was the "lack of time to give more individual attention" to the Open Enrollment child. This lack of time for individual attention was attributed to large class size, and excessive number of instructional groups, and the need to take care of the needs of the other pupils in the class.

5. Courses Taken by Reading Teachers in Teaching Remedial Reading and Teaching Disadvantaged Children

The corrective reading teachers were asked whether they had taken any special courses in the teaching of remedial reading. The majority of them (80 percent) answered affirmatively. Only 13 percent had either an M.A. or an M.S. in Reading; 10 percent had an M.A. in Education; one person an M.A. in English; and one person indicated that she was working on an M.A. in Measurement. The remainder indicated that they had taken one, two, three, some or several courses.

More than half of the corrective reading teachers (59 percent) indicated that they had not taken any courses dealing with disadvantaged children. However, some of these teachers added that they had taught in Special Service schools, had read extensively, or had worked in agencies serving the underpriviledged.

D. QUANTITATIVE ASSESSMENT OF CORRECTIVE READING SERVICES

1. Degree of Parent Involvement

Although all of the coordinators indicated that their reading programs had a parent program only three reported a specific program aimed at promoting parent involvement. For the majority (nine), parent involvement meant routine conferences with parents. Many coordinators (seven) indicated that even these routine parental conferences were not successful due to the difficulties encountered by corrective reading teachers in arranging for conferences with parents.

Home, work responsibilities, and transportation difficulties were cited as reasons for the lack of response from parents to requests for conference appointments.

The special programs for parents which were discussed included a reading-guidance clinic for children with reading problems and their mothers, a workshop just for mothers and a workshop for family workers assigned to contact parents in the sending school community. Although several district proposals mentioned the hiring of family workers to promote home-school relations, the fact that only one coordinator mentioned this aspect of the program suggests that it was not coordinated with the reading program in most of the districts.

2. Parent-Teacher Conferences

Whereas the reading coordinators stated that the corrective reading teachers were unsuccessful in arranging parent-teacher conferences, both the corrective reading teachers and the classroom teachers indicated that they had been successful for the most part in scheduling conferences with parents of Open Enrollment children. Three-fourths of the classroom teachers said that they had been able to schedule from one to five conferences with the parents of Open Enrollment children with 10 percent claiming more than five. Sixty-eight percent of the corrective reading teachers had been able to schedule conferences with Open Enrollment parents. Those unable to schedule any parent-teacher conferences (15 percent of the classroom teachers and 32 percent of the corrective reading teachers) cited similar reasons. Lack of response on the part of parents was most often attributed to the difficulties and high cost of transportation to schools out of their own neighborhoods. One teacher pointed out that the school aides had been helpful in carrying messages to parents. Other teachers pointed out that the interested parents came to school and that the disinterested ones did not; however, the disinterested ones were in the minority. In addition, some corrective reading teachers cited the fact that their position in the school was part-time and did not allow time for such conferences. Others indicated that there was little need for them to attempt to schedule parent conferences because the classroom teacher and the guidance counselor performed this function.

3. Availability of Curriculum Materials

When questioned about the extent to which they had the curriculum materials they needed for Open Enrollment pupils, over half (59 percent) of the classroom teachers indicated that they had all or mostly all they needed. Many qualified their answers to include all of the children. Over three-fourths of the corrective reading teachers (79 percent) indicated that they had all or mostly all that they needed. At the other extreme, 36 percent of the classroom teachers and 11 percent of the reading teachers indicated that they had none of the materials they needed.

E. ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

1. Pupil Progress as a Result of Corrective Reading Instruction

Asked to indicate the amount of change they had observed in the pupils who had participated in the corrective reading groups, both sets of teachers had seen some progress for almost all pupils about equally divided between "marked" and "slight" progress. Marked progress had been observed by 44 percent of the classroom teachers and 49 percent of the corrective reading teachers, and slight progress by 50 percent of the classroom teachers and by 51 percent of the corrective reading teachers.

2. The Effects of the Open Enrollment Program on the Open Enrollment and Resident Pupils

More than half of both groups of teachers (66 percent of the classroom and 71 percent of the corrective reading) felt that the Open Enrollment program had a positive effect on the Open Enrollment children. In contrast, less than half of both groups of teachers (43 percent of the classroom teachers and 21 percent of the corrective reading teachers) saw a positive effect of the program on the resident children. Both groups of teachers generally cited benefits which could be classified as educational and social for the Open Enrollment child. However, the benefits generally cited for the resident child could be classified as social only. The majority of these answers spoke to the fact that the program afforded the resident pupils the opportunity to "find out how the other half lives."

Those teachers who gave a negative response to the effects of the program on Open Enrollment children fell into two groups: one group cited the detrimental effects of the long bus ride on the children, the other referred to the disruptive behavior of the Open Enrollment children in class. Those teachers who saw a negative effect of the program on the resident children (13 percent of the corrective reading teachers and 28 percent of the classroom teachers) most often cited the adverse effects of the Open Enrollment students' behavior on the behavior of the resident children. However, half of the reading teachers (52 percent) saw no effects of the program on resident pupils. They qualified these answers by indicating that the resident children had learned to accept the Open Enrollment children and that the children who came to them all had the same problems and benefited in the same way. Fewer classroom teachers (29 percent) saw no effects of the program on the resident children and those who did qualified this several times by indicating that the resident children accepted the Open Enrollment children. It was interesting to note that a few teachers pointed out that the resident children were not affected by the program but that some parents and some teachers were experiencing some bad effects.

3. Reading Achievement

Reading achievement data were obtained for 392 Open Enrollment children who participated in corrective reading classes. The MAT scores for Spring 1968 and Spring 1969 were analyzed to determine changes in reading level for third, fourth, fifth, and sixth grade students. Table IV-3 presents these data. Overall gains of at least two-tenths of a year were made by three-fourths (74 percent) of these children, a bit more than half (55 percent) gained a half year or more in the shortened school year, and one in four (28 percent) gained the nine months or more normally expected.[1] There was no change for 10 percent, while 17 percent lost. Only one pupil made a loss of more than one year whereas 30 children (8 percent) gained 1.7 or more.

These data correspond to those of previous evaluations of this program both in reflecting loss by a minority of OE pupils and less than normal progress for a majority.

---

[1] Between April 1968 and April 1969 there were only 7 of the expected 10 months of instruction and so normal expectation is difficult to estimate for this particular year.

TABLE IV-3

CHANGE IN READING ACHIEVEMENT FROM SPRING 1968 TO SPRING 1969
OE PUPILS IN CORRECTIVE READING GROUPS
THIRD, FOURTH, FIFTH AND SIXTH GRADE
TOTAL N = 392

Change	N	%
Gain of:		
1.7 or more	30	8
.9 to 1.6	82	20
.5 to .8	104	27
.2 to .4	73	19
Total Gaining:	289	74
Total with no change:		
-.1 to +.1	38	10
Loss of:		
.2 to .5	42	10
.6 to 1.0	22	6
More than 1.0	1	---(less than 1%)
Total losing:	65	17
Median change:	.69	

CHAPTER V

GUIDANCE SERVICES

A. INTRODUCTION

This phase of the evaluation directs itself to the quantitative and qualitative dimensions of the guidance services. Interviews were conducted with nine guidance supervisors, 37 guidance counselors and one school social worker. The group of guidance personnel represented 15 districts, 24 elementary schools, six junior high schools, and four high schools. Structured guides were used during the interviews and were aimed at determining: 1. the extent to which Open Enrollment children were served; 2. the types of guidance services offered; 3. the reasons for Open Enrollment referrals; 4. the type of supervision received by guidance counselors; 5. the educational background of guidance counselors; 6. the opinions of guidance personnel as to the adequacy of the program; and 7. the problems encountered in attempting to implement the program.

The findings and discussion where applicable will be discussed jointly for guidance supervisors and guidance counselors and will be presented under three main headings:

1. Qualitative Assessment
2. Quantitative Assessment
3. Assessment of Program Objectives

B. QUALITATIVE ASSESSMENT

1. The Identification and Method of Selection of OE Pupils for Guidance Services

Of the nine guidance supervisors, seven said that the guidance positions funded under Title I were utilized to serve Open Enrollment pupils primarily. Of the guidance counselors in the sample, 44 percent said they worked with more Open Enrollment students than with resident pupils. However, only five of the 37 counselors and the school social worker indicated that they worked only with Open Enrollment pupils. Of the 34 counselors who answered the question, 56 percent of the counselors indicated that when their programs included group guidance the groups were composed of Open Enrollment and resident pupils. In some instances (24 percent) the composition of groups varied, sometimes composed only of Open Enrollment students and other times of both Open Enrollment and resident students. No group guidance was reported by 11 percent and group sessions composed of only Open Enrollment pupils were reported by nine percent of the counselors.

Although the district proposals generally spelled out their goals in terms of providing specific services to Open Enrollment students, the district supervisors tended to view their goals as more comprehensive, in that the provision of educational and vocational counseling should be provided to all children including those not experiencing difficulties. Some of the supervisors expressed concern with the restrictions imposed by the guidelines. They felt that supplying service primarily to Open Enrollment children was somewhat unfair especially where the services for resident pupils were inadequate. The supervisors were of the opinion that where group guidance was practiced, adhering to the guidelines would be detrimental to the Open Enrollment child. Their consensus was the removal of only Open Enrollment children from a classroom for guidance sessions would have a stereotyping effect. It was suggested that this problem would arise for counselors who were conducting parent workshops.

Only four of the nine supervisors indicated that they had instructed counselors to screen Open Enrollment pupils at the beginning of the year. Three of the supervisors said that those Open Enrollment pupils who needed guidance received it and this usually resulted in a "crisis oriented" program. It was mentioned that in schools with large numbers of Open Enrollment students it would be impossible to screen all of them effectively.

Although most of the guidance counselors qualified their answers to include all students, they indicated several bases for selecting Open Enrollment students for individual counseling. Teachers and other school personnel most often (43 percent) referred students, self-referrals by students were mentioned 30 percent of the time. Other bases infrequently mentioned in comparison with the other two included an examination of previous records (8 percent), parents (9 percent), friends (7 percent), and the State Employment Service (3 percent).

Half (53 percent) of the counselors indicated that more than half to three-fourths of the Open Enrollment students they counseled were boys. In only three cases did the counselors indicate that they counseled more girls than boys. The others (38 percent) counseled as many boys as girls.

Guidance counselors reported that both behavioral problems and academic problems were the major reasons Open Enrollment students were referred for counseling with health problems, personal and social maladjustment, lack of food, and attendance as other reasons for referrals. One high school counselor pointed out that lateness was the main cause for all referrals in his school.

2. Items of Procedure

a. Records Kept for Open Enrollment Students

The guidance supervisors said that records and evaluation procedures were the same for Open Enrollment students as they were for other students. Although practices differed from school to school most guidance counselors indicated that they kept either a card file with pertinent information on all students who were served, a guidance folder for all, and/or a cumulative folder. The cumulative folder in most cases would contain: an anecdotal record, teachers' comments, records of parental interviews, a summary of the child's academic progress, agency information, and any information from previous schools attended.

The majority (60 percent) of the counselors indicated that either they kept a confidential folder, or that they considered the cumulative folder confidential. Only the guidance counselor and the principal had access to this confidential information. Indications were that the counselor either interpreted the information for the teacher or allowed a teacher to see only selected bits of information. It was pointed out by some of the counselors that parental permission is needed to send psychological data to other schools. Some (3) counselors also indicated that they withheld data which might prove damaging to the child when the child transferred to another school.

These records, according to seven of the nine supervisors, were reviewed by the principals or guidance supervisors. However, five supervisors pointed out that there was not sufficient time for this. The responsibility for the maintenance of adequate records varied. In three districts the supervisors shared the responsibility with the principals, in three the guidance counselor had the primary responsibility, in two districts the supervisor alone assumed responsibility, and in one district the principals alone had the responsibility.

The large majority of the counselors (84 percent) indicated that there was someone in the school responsible for reviewing the records of the individual Open Enrollment student. Over half (59 percent) said that the review was done on a regular basis. Others (20 percent) indicated that this review was done only for severe problems and one counselor indicated that the review was done only for placement.

In contrast to what was said by the supervisors,[1] either the guidance counselor or the principal alone assumed the responsibility for the review in 70 percent of the cases (equally divided). In the other cases (9 percent) the principal and guidance counselors did the review together. In only two cases did the counselors indicate that the principal, the guidance counselor, and the district supervisor review the records together.

---

[1] It is likely that the supervisors meant that they had the responsibility to see that records were kept, rather than keep them themselves.

b. Availability of Time to Perform Duties

When questioned about the amount of time they spent working solely with children in their guidance capacity, 40 percent of the counselors indicated that they spent all of their time with the children. The other 60 percent indicated that they spent varying amounts of time (from 35 to 90 percent) with the children, the remainder of the time being spent keeping records, working with teachers and/or parents, making industry contacts, and doing junior high school articulation work. One guidance counselor indicated that she spent only 30 percent of her time with the children because of the nature of the school which requires much record work connected with private school placement.

The counselors indicated that their jobs entailed the performance of a wide variety of duties, most frequently individual counseling and group guidance. Table V-1 presents a detailed account of all the duties reported by the group.

Six of the nine supervisors rated guidance services as "inadequate" for Open Enrollment pupils primarily because of insufficient personnel. Two of the supervisors mentioned insufficient school and community agencies available to augment the work of the guidance counselors. Seven supervisors rated guidance services as "inadequate" for resident children as well, with one of the opinion that they were "adequate." One supervisor said that he could not generalize because adequacy varied by school.

TABLE V-1

DUTIES REPORTED PERFORMED BY GUIDANCE COUNSELORS
(In Order of Frequency of Mention)
N=37

Duty	Number of Mentions
1. Individual counseling	26
2. Group guidance (personal, vocational and educational)	24
3. Individual parent conferences	12
4. Pupil placement	12
5. Referrals-summer schools, camps, Saturday classes, after school program	7
6. Teacher workshops	6
7. Reading-Guidance teams	6
8. Parent workshops	5
9. Math tutoring	3
10. Working with family assistants	2
11. Orientation	2
12. Support (making new child feel at home)	2
13. Health service	2
14. Miscellaneous one mention each-curriculum, attendance, play groups, articulation with feeder schools, working with outside resources, role playing, securing and dispensing vocational information, securing clothing, working with children planning to leave school.	

Half (51 percent) of the counselors said that they felt that they could serve the needs of half of the Open Enrollment children with their present resources, with 41 percent indicating that they could "mostly" serve these needs. The remainder (8 percent) felt that they could "only slightly" serve the needs of the Open Enrollment children with their present resources. The reasons most often reported were lack of time (26 mentions), inadequate school resources (23 mentions), and inadequate community resources (7 mentions). Then there were the individual responses, i.e, one counselor indicated that he had difficulty serving the children's needs because he had such heavy record demands in the 9th grade; another that she felt inadequate in handling the needs of the children because the children came to school without breakfast.

The data disclosed that for most of the counselors there was a relatively long wait for the pupil when he was referred to an outside agency. Only one counselor indicated that the wait was from one to two weeks while four counselors answered they could obtain "immediate" placement. For the majority of the counselors (60 percent) the wait was reported to be from four months to a year including 27 percent who simply described it as "a long time." Some counselors indicated that there were not enough agencies in their districts, that the Bureau of Child Guidance was especially slow, or where there was a fee the wait was related to the reasonableness of the fee.

c. The Relationship of Counseling to the Classroom

When asked if the classroom teachers had time for conferences with them concerning Open Enrollment children, 97 percent of the counselors answered affirmatively. They indicated that most often they conferred with teachers during class time and many of them pointed out that the classes were covered by someone else at this time. The next most frequently mentioned times utilized for conferences were during the teachers' preparation period or during the lunch period. Other counselors indicated that either the teacher requested advice, or there was a mutual seeking out, or they made time, or they saw one another before school convened.

The majority (79 percent) of the counselors indicated that their guidance program was coordinated with classroom teaching in a variety of ways. Asked to indicate how it was coordinated,the counselors most often mentioned that they held conferences with teachers to offer suggestions. Next in order they mentioned that they conducted classroom guidance lessons, and classroom observations.

A majority of the counselors (61 percent) rated the academic program in the school as appropriate for "all or most" of the Open Enrollment students. Twenty-nine percent found it "inappropriate" for some and 3 percent "inappropriate for all." The remainder (8 percent) indicated that they didn't know. In the majority of instances, where the academic program was not considered appropriate for all, the counselors felt that the courses were taught at too high a level.

When asked if they had discussed special teaching approaches for Open Enrollment students with classroom teachers, 84 percent of the guidance counselors indicated that they had. They also indicated that the teachers had been completely cooperative. However, 15 percent of the counselors indicated that they had discussed only an individual pupil and had not discussed subject matter. Those few who had not discussed special teaching approaches with teachers but said that they had wanted to, had not done so because of a fear of "stepping on a fellow professional's toes," or because they "lacked the time."

d. The Evening Guidance Centers

Two districts in the sample had indicated in their proposal the intention to provide guidance services to students and parents in the sending school community.

The guidance supervisor in one district indicated that the evening center got a late start and was not sufficiently utilized until April. This was after the first report card had been issued. The plan in this district was to provide two guidance counselors to work with Junior High School Open Enrollment pupils and parents in their own neighborhood during the hours of 7:30 P.M. to 9:30 P.M. There was to be a family assistant to act as liaison between the regular day school counselors and the evening counselors. It was also proposed that a stenographer or transcribing typist be employed to assist the counselors with their record keeping. The acting guidance counselor was given a small case load so that she might recruit pupils for the evening center. This counselor was formerly a teacher at the sending school and knew the pupils and their problems.

One of the problems, cited by the supervisor, was the difficulty associated with getting counselors from the receiving school to work at the evening clinic during the evening hours. The counselors now at the center are not receiving school staff and this has caused a communications gap between the teachers at the receiving school and the people at the clinic. Nevertheless, the supervisor indicated that the evening clinic has some distinct advantages. He cited the fact that the evening clinic is not subject to the same pressures as the day school, there are fewer interruptions, and the "souped up" atmosphere of the Junior High School is not descriptive of the evening clinic. He stated that they saw from four to six parents per evening. (The report of a field observation of the other Center by a staff member of the evaluation team appears in Appendix C.)

e. Perception of Purpose of the Open Enrollment Program

Five of the nine guidance supervisors and 26 percent of the counselors perceived the purpose of the Open Enrollment program to be that of primarily providing services aimed at improving the educational level of children from less advantaged areas. One supervisor and 30 percent of the counselors perceived the same purpose but in addition they saw the program as a means of providing an integrated setting to achieve these educational goals. Three of the guidance supervisors and six counselors (16 percent) felt that the purpose of the Open Enrollment program was primarily that of "promoting integration." One guidance counselor who saw the program as intended to promote integration and improve education felt it was being implemented by allowing sending schools to get rid of their discipline problems. Other guidance counselors mentioned such purposes as relieving overcrowded conditions in sending schools and allowing parents to have a free choice in where they sent their children to school.

f. Knowledge of Program Guidelines

Seven of the nine supervisors indicated that they had received the guidelines from the Board of Education. Seven of them had been involved in preparing their district's proposal. For four of the seven this involvement included helping to plan and write the proposal and for the other three it consisted mainly of participating in making counselor placement decisions.

The type of knowledge afforded the supervisors was not available to the great majority of the guidance counselors. Only 18 percent of them had seen the proposal, and of the 82 percent who had not seen the proposal the majority (82 percent) knew nothing about it.

The guidance counselors were asked if they had received any information from their principals or guidance supervisors concerning the services to be provided to Open Enrollment students. Half (51 percent) had received no information at all. Those who had (49 percent), received information from the guidance supervisors alone (22 percent), or with the principal (24 percent), or from the principal alone (3 percent).

The guidance supervisors, although relatively familiar with the proposals, were not always in agreement with the proposals as to the number of positions to be funded under Title I. Only two mentioned the same number as the proposal while the others mentioned either more or less.

C. QUANTITATIVE ASSESSMENT

1. Professional Background of Guidance Counselors

The majority (84 percent) of the guidance counselors held a guidance license in the New York City public schools. One each held the following licenses: Educational and Vocational Counseling, School Social Worker, and Principal's license. Only three of the counselors interviewed were identified as acting counselors.

2. Teaching and Guidance Experience

Table V-2 presents data relative to the teaching and guidance experience of the counselors. The largest number (42 percent) of counselors had been classroom teachers from six to ten years before becoming guidance counselors. Over half (63 percent) had been classroom teachers from four to ten years before becoming guidance counselors.

Half (53 percent) of the counselors indicated that they had been guidance counselors from four to twenty years with the largest grouping (34 percent) having been counselors from six to ten years.

More than half (58 percent) of the counselors had been counselors in the schools interviewed for one or more years.

D. ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

The effects of the Open Enrollment program on attitudes, behavior and achievement of Open Enrollment and resident children were sought in interviews with supervisors.

When asked to comment on the effects they felt the Open Enrollment program had on the Open Enrollment children, four of the nine supervisors gave positive responses stating that the program had helped to raise the aspirational levels of the students and had a generally beneficial effect on the majority of the youngsters. Their generalizations were qualified, however, with references to the number of Open Enrollment children in a class, the teacher's personality and experience, and the nature of the class. Of the other five supervisors, two believed that the effect was positive before the recent teachers' strike but since the fall they believe that some of the children have begun to resent coming to an out-of-district school. Two said that they could

TABLE V-2

TEACHING AND GUIDANCE EXPERIENCE OF GUIDANCE COUNSELORS,
PERCENT IN EACH CATEGORY
N=38

Category of Experience	Number of Years 1 year or less	1-2	3-4	4-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	20+
Classroom experience before becoming guidance counselor	3	0	5	21	42	13	5	11
Experience as guidance counselor	18	8	21	13	34	3	0	3
Experience as teacher in school where interviewed	37	5	29	13	8	5	0	3
Experience as guidance counselor in school where interviewed	42	8	31	16	3			

not generalize. The one supervisor who gave a negative response based it on the fact that the children could not attend the same high school as their friends and had limited opportunities for social interaction with resident pupils.

The effect of the Open Enrollment program on the resident students was also seen in positive terms by four of the nine supervisors. Two said the effect depended on the receiving neighborhood -- its degree of acceptance of the Open Enrollment children. They also thought that the type of Open Enrollment child in the class had a relationship to the effects on the resident child. Only one supervisor gave a totally negative response to this question, stating that "some have learned to be afraid of black kids because of incidents" and he also felt that it was more difficult for teachers to individualize instruction.

CHAPTER VI

OE RECEIVING SCHOOLS: UTILIZATION RATES AND ETHNIC DISTRIBUTION

A. INTRODUCTION

The implementation of the OE program is related to one Board of Education objective: to further integrate and utilize the City's schools. Basic to this relationship are some complaints advanced by principals during this and earlier evaluations of the program. A number of principals noted their frustration with receiving large numbers of OE students when their schools were overcrowded to begin with. An analysis of the utilization rates and the ethnic distribution in OE schools was conducted to determine if there was evidence of justification for these complaints. The following section presents these data and the data on the ethnic distribution in more detail.

B. UTILIZATION

Analysis of the utilization rates for OE receiving schools in 1968 would indicate that the complaints are not justified at the elementary level. However, both junior and senior high schools in the program are extensively utilized. Table VI-1 presents data on the 1968 utilization rates for OE schools. These data indicate that at the elementary level more than twice as many (23 percent) schools are utilized less than 70 percent as were overutilized (8 percent). Half the elementary schools (53 percent) were utilized from 70 to 89 percent.

TABLE VI-1

PERCENT WHICH OPEN ENROLLMENT RECEIVING SCHOOLS WERE UTILIZED IN 1968

Utilization Percent	Elementary N	Junior High Intermediate N	High Schools N
20-29	1		
30-39	2		
40-49	3		
50-59	8		
60-69	15	1	
70-79	29	3	
80-89	38	2	
90-100	20	13	
101-109	9	13	1
110-119	1	9	2
120-129		2	5
130-139			1
140-149			3
Total	126	43	12

At the junior high level only one school was utilized less than 70 percent whereas more than half (55 percent) were over-utilized. Only five schools (12 percent) were utilized between 70 and 89 percent.

At the senior high school level there was 100 percent over-utilization of OE receiving schools.

C. ETHNIC DISTRUBUTION

Ethnic data[1] for 123 elementary, 43 junior high and intermediate, and 12 academic high schools participating in the 1968 OE program were analyzed. Ethnic data for non-OE schools in the 21 districts participating in the program were also analyzed. These data reflect some movement in the direction of integration and at the same time reflect movement in the direction of segregation in some schools. The following section discusses these data in more detail.

1. Ethnic Distribution for OE Schools in 1967

Table VI-2 presents data on the percent "other"[2] in OE receiving schools for 1967. The general pattern of a majority of students being "other" was similar for all school levels. Among the elementary schools 79 percent had from 60 to 100 percent "other." At the junior high and intermediate level 88 percent of the schools had from 60 to 100 percent "other." Among high schools 91 percent had from 60 to 100 percent "other."

---

[1] Data were collected for 1959, 1963 and 1967. The 1968 data were not available. These data were obtained from the New York City Board of Education.

[2] "Other" refers to those students who are not black or Puerto Rican.

TABLE VI-2

PERCENT OF CHILDREN "OTHER" THAN BLACK OR PUERTO RICAN IN OPEN ENROLLMENT SCHOOLS-1967

	Elementary	Junior High Intermediate	High Schools
Percent	N	N	N
"Other"			
20-29	2		
30-39	1	2	
40-49	1		
50-59	9	3	1
60-69	22	6	
70-79	30	9	3
80-89	40	20	7
90-100	21	3	1
Total	126	43	12

Table VI-3 presents data on the changes in percent "other" for some of the OE receiving schools over the eight year period from 1959 to 1967. While all but three elementary schools showed a decrease in "other" students during this period the most frequent decrease was from one to 29 percent for over half of all the schools: 83 percent of the elementary schools, 78 percent for junior high schools, and 100 percent for high schools. The median decreases were: 14.2 percent at the elementary level; 16.5 percent at the junior high level, and 13.9 percent at the senior high level.

There were 27 schools showing a decrease of 30 percent or more. Eighteen of these schools were elementary schools. Table VI-4 gives a breakdown of these schools. Four schools showed the greatest decrease: 43.2 percent, 47.0 percent, 55.8 percent, and 62.9 percent. However, as a result all four fell below 50 percent "other."[3] In addition, all of these schools were overutilized in 1968. Yet all four received bussed in children in 1968-69 as part of the Open Enrollment Program.

---

[3] The New York Commissioner of Education defined a racially imbalanced school as one having 50 percent or more Negro pupils enrolled. United States Commission on Civil Rights, Racial Isolation in the Public Schools (Washington, D.C., 1967), p. 186.

TABLE VI-3

CHANGE IN PERCENT "OTHER" IN OPEN ENROLLMENT SCHOOLS[a] FROM 1959-1967

Change in Percent "Other"	Elementary	Junior High & Intermediate	High School
	N	N	N
Decrease of:			
1-9	26	4	1
10-19	48	19	7
20-29	28	8	3
30-39	11	7	
40-49	5	1	
50-59	1	1	
60-69	1		
Increase	3		
No change	0	0	0
Totals	123	40	11

---

[a] These schools represent schools for which data were available for 1959, 1963, and 1967.

TABLE VI-4

INDIVIDUAL DATA ON 18 ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS IN OPEN ENROLLMENT PROGRAM SHOWING A DECREASE IN PERCENT "OTHER" OF 30 PERCENT OR MORE FROM 1959-1967

School	District	Ethnic Distribution Percent "Other"			Percent Total Decrease	1968 Utilization Rate
		1959	1963	1967		
1	A	99.8	85.8	68.7	31.1	59
2	A	99.7	76.3	66.5	33.2	56
3	B	100.0	77.2	67.0	33.0	51
4	C	99.1	82.6	56.9	42.0	86
5	C	98.8	71.4	62.1	36.7	88
6	C	99.2	84.4	64.1	35.1	80
7	D	98.9	72.2	56.4	42.5	33
8	E	85.6	80.2	29.8	55.8	109
9	E	85.8	71.8	22.9	62.9	104
10	E	78.4	63.8	35.2	43.2	108
11	E	96.5	87.2	56.6	39.9	95
12	E	96.8	90.7	58.6	38.2	92
13	E	90.0	86.5	53.9	36.1	109
14	G	96.8	84.0	56.5	40.3	76
15	G	93.8	82.0	46.8	47.0	101
16	H	95.8	71.1	64.4	31.4	63
17	H	99.5	94.7	69.2	30.3	83
18	H	91.2	76.8	59.8	31.4	85

To determine whether or not these four schools were unique an analysis was made of the ethnic distribution in schools not designated OE receiving schools. Those schools not included in the 1968-69 OE program but which are located in the 21 districts represented this year were selected. Some of these schools had been included in the 1967-68 OE program. Table VI-5 presents these data.

The data show significant changes in two categories: the increase in schools with under 50 percent "other" and the decrease of schools with from 90-100 percent "other." Whereas 30 percent of the schools had under 50 percent "other" in 1959 there were 42 percent in this category in 1967. (Table VI-5 presents these data).

TABLE VI-5

PERCENT "OTHER" IN NON-OE ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS[a] IN DISTRICTS SUBMITTING PROPOSALS IN 1968

Percent "Other"	1959 N=255	1963 N=255	1967 N=255	Overall Gain or Loss
Under 50	75	85	105	+30
50 to 59	5	11	11	+6
60 to 69	8	12	15	+7
70 to 79	16	22	14	-2
80 to 89	30	21	34	+4
90 to 100	121	104	76	-45
Total	255	255	255	

---

[a] A total of 34 (13 percent) of these schools were listed on the 1967-68 OE proposal.

Table VI-6 presents data on 19 schools all in one district as an example of what this reversal in ethnic distribution can ultimately mean. These data show that 16 of the 19 schools are below 50 percent "other." Three of the schools below 50 percent "other" are listed on the 1968-69 OE program as a receiving school. Fourteen of the 19 schools are 100 percent or more utilized. This district is located in an area characterized by an influx of blacks and Puerto Ricans and an exodus of whites. Where the white families are not leaving the neighborhood they are increasing the attendance of their children in private and/or parochial schools.

The data presented reflect limited movement in the direction of racial balance in large part because of the lack of success in holding racial balance once it was achieved in a school.

An analysis of the utilization rates of non-OE elementary schools in the 21 districts (Table VI-6 presents these data) indicates that the majority of them are utilized 70 percent or more. Thus, the degree to which racial balance can ever be achieved, with the present level of school buildings, is limited.

TABLE VI-6

A COMPARISON OF ETHNIC BALANCE IN OE AND NON OE SCHOOLS OF ALL ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS IN ONE DISTRICT BY PERCENT "OTHER" AND 1968 PERCENT UTILIZATION RATES

School	Percent "Other" 1959	1963	1967	1968 Utilization Rate
A[a]	96.5	87.2	56.6	95
B[a]	96.8	90.7	58.6	92
C[a]	90.0	86.5	53.9	109
D[a]	85.6	80.2	29.8	109
E[a]	85.8	71.8	22.9	104
F[a]	78.4	63.8	35.2	108
G	--	5.4	3.8	132
H	89.4	67.7	29.3	121
I[b]	84.1	66.5	26.8	132
J	75.6	50.3	18.0	114
K	75.2	61.9	19.0	113
L	11.4	4.2	1.6	101
M	2.3	1.6	2.3	88
N	20.9	10.7	2.1	99
O	1.2	.3	.7	100
P	35.6	31.4	11.3	110
Q	45.5	36.0	13.1	128
R	3.9	2.6	1.4	102
S	--	--	1.3	118

[a] In 1968-69 OE program

[b] In 1967-68 OE program

TABLE VI-7

COMPARISON OF PERCENT "OTHER" AND UTILIZATION RATES IN NON OE ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS IN DISTRICTS SUBMITTING PROPOSALS IN 1968

1968 Utilization Rate Percent	Percent "Other"					
	Under 50 N=105	50-59 N=11	60-69 N=15	70-79 N=14	80-89 N=34	90-100 N=76
20-29						
30-39				1		
40-49	1			1	1	1
50-59	2		1		3	2
60-69	3		1	1	4	4
70-79	20	3	2		10	14
80-89	19	1	4	4	9	27
90-100	20	6	5	5	6	21
101-109	15		1	2	1	3
110-119	14		1			4
120-129	4					
130-139	5					
140-149	1					
150-159	1					
Total	105	11	15	14	34	76

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The conclusions presented in this chapter are directed to the implementation of the program, as it relates to the proposals as submitted by the 21 districts and as proposed by the formal Board of Education proposal. These conclusions will be presented under the following headings:

1. The Provision of Additional Personnel and Services
2. Corrective Reading Services
3. Guidance Services: Utilization and Ethnic Distribution

A. THE PROVISION OF ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL AND SERVICES

The data indicated that there was a close correlation between the number of positions proposed and those reported received by the principals. However, because these data also indicated that not all these positions were new positions, there is reason to question this correlation.

The requests by principals for additional corrective reading teachers, guidance counselors, and other auxiliary personnel were most often accompanied by a statement that additional personnel was needed for both resident and Open Enrollment students. Many of the principals made remarks concerning the extent of integration in their schools so that they could not discuss Open Enrollment students as a separate entity. Some of the principals pointed out that they have more and more resident pupils who are in need of remedial and guidance services. Nevertheless, the proposed "additional" positions are described in the proposals, in accordance with both state and federal guidelines, as positions to be provided primarily to serve the Open Enrollment children.

The new additional positions actually created or provided for Open Enrollment children need careful scrutiny. The supervisory interviews indicated that in many cases the positions were not being used primarily for Open Enrollment children. Interviews with some principals reveal that they operate with complete autonomy and can use "additional" positions as they see fit. In addition, because of the reduction in the number of personnel funded by the city school budget it appears that in many cases the funds alloted for Open Enrollment activities have merely provided for the maintenance of positions that were initially funded by the city. When this is done, compensatory education for the deprived is not that at all, for nothing is provided which was not available earlier.

B. CORRECTIVE READING SERVICES

The data relating to the corrective reading services indicated a generally successful program. The majority of the corrective reading classes were found to be well taught, well planned, and held in rooms especially set up for this purpose.

The data also revealed that the school system lacks diagnostic facilities. The provision of such facilities was specifically mentioned in the formal proposal. It would appear that the corrective reading program would be significantly enhanced if diagnostic facilities were provided.

Johnson and Myklebust of the Institute for Language Disorders, Northwestern University, speak to this point. They state: [1]

> The single most important factor in planning for a child with a learning disability is an intensive diagnostic study. Without a comprehensive evaluation of his deficits and assets, the educational program may be too general, or even inappropriate. The diagnostic study should include an evaluation of sensory acuity, intelligence, language (spoken, read, and written), motor function, educational achievement, emotional status, and social maturity. In addition, an evaluation should be made by the pediatrician, the neurologist, the opthamologist, and by others as indicated by the nature of the child's deficiencies.

Heller[2] has suggested that there are additional instances where cooperative funding of programs under both Title I and Title III might be undertaken. The diagnostic aspect of corrective reading could be carried on in a supplementary center under Title III and implemented either in the schools or in district centers under Title I. Conceivably children transferred to Open Enrollment schools could provide the basis for a research bank in the area of reading disabilities.

Also in the area of corrective reading some attention should be given to the educational standards by which corrective reading teachers and classroom teachers, who are to work with Open Enrollment students, are selected. It is quite possible that the classroom teacher who is better trained in corrective techniques could maintain a contained classroom of children with reading difficulties. Many teachers noted in the questionnaire that they felt Open Enrollment children could be taught in the same manner as other children, often qualifying this statement to mean, "if they presented no problems." Only four out of

---

[1] Doris J. Johnson and Helmer R. Myklebust, Learning Disabilities: Educational Principles and Practices, New York: Grune and Stratton, 1967. p. 51-52.

[2] Barbara Heller, A History and Description of ESEA Title I in New York City, 1965-68. New York: The Center for Urban Education. p. 209.

50 corrective reading teachers had an M.A. or M.S. in corrective reading. Even fewer had taken any course work on working with the disadvantaged child although several mentioned that they had gotten on the job training either in Special Service schools or outside agencies. In line with this it would appear mandatory to supply more black teachers to Open Enrollment receiving schools. Several observers noted a lack of them in the schools.

C. GUIDANCE SERVICES

Although our evaluation indicates that guidance services attract well trained and very sensitive people, there was also found to be a distressing lack of backup. Guidance counselors spend an inordinate amount of time on record-keeping and other duties which could hardly be classed as a guidance function. One counselor who works in a wealthy district spends only 30 percent of her time with children because she has to prepare records for students who are about to enter private schools. Ideally the guidance counselor should spend as much time as possible with students who need counseling. Clerical assistance for the guidance counselor might help to reduce the need for so many additional counselors.

Guidance counselors indicated that there is a long wait for many children before they can be seen by an outside agency. Some indicated that the Bureau of Child Guidance was especially slow in seeing referred children. The counselors also spoke to the issue of the unavailability of Open Enrollment parents, and the problem of the unattended health needs of some of the children. While family workers have been an asset to most of the schools fortunate to have them, social workers are even more needed for this program. A comprehensive guidance-counseling, health, psychological and social program is needed, preferably decentralized and located in sending school communities. Continuing to deplore the lack of availability of Open Enrollment parents as a reason for failure of compensatory education programs does not make a positive contribution to the problem. Mohammed must go to the mountain. The two evening centers discussed in the body of the report have made a good start. However, both have been in operation for a very short time and from all indications will need additional help if they are ultimately to be successful. A comprehensive pilot program such as the one previously mentioned could be started at both of these centers and could also be funded under Title III.

D. UTILIZATION AND ETHNIC DISTRIBUTION

The Open Enrollment program in operation since 1960 was an attempt on the part of the New York City Board of Education to eliminate "de facto" segregation in the schools of the city. Funds for the implementation of the program at the start came from the city budget and from a special State Integration Fund. After the Passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 the Board of Education received federal funds to aid in the operation of the Open Enrollment program. These federal funds along with a Special State Integration Fund and city tax levy funds now provide the financial backbone for the program.

In the early stages of the Open Enrollment program the children who participated were those minority group children whose parents had the choice of transferring them from predominantly black neighborhood schools to schools with a more varied ethnic distribution. However, over the passage of time this aspect of the program has received less, and less attention. Instead, as evidenced by the 1967-68 evaluation, the Board of Education transferred increasing numbers of children under various plans aimed at better utilization of schools and at achieving more integrated schools.

The data relating to the utilization of Open Enrollment receiving schools indicated that a large portion of the elementary schools are utilized less than 70 percent. More than half of the junior high schools are overutilized and all of the high schools are overutilized.

The data indicate that racial balance has not been maintained where it has been achieved. These data would indicate that while the Open Enrollment program is a successful device for achieving racial balance, the balance will soon be tipped in the opposite direction (from predominantly "other" to predominantly minority) if no factors (such as programs recognized by parents as of high quality) are introduced to maintain it.

E. RECOMMENDATIONS

Specifically the recommendations which follow from the evaluation are:

1. The need to identify children receiving services from each funded program.
2. The need to clearly identify personnel whose position is supported by each funded program.
3. Development of a procedure to identify records of Open Enrollment children to facilitate evaluation of progress.

4. Establishment of policy to guide local options on whether funds can be used to provide services to resident as well as Open Enrollment children.

5. The need for a clear distinction between "new and additional" services, and established services newly funded under this program.

6. Establishment of a diagnostic reading program and/or facility, possibly by coordinating Title I and Title III proposals.

7. The establishment of minimum standards of experience and training for corrective reading teachers hired under this program.

8. Provision of clerical assistance to guidance counselors.

This first year of decentralized administration of the Open Enrollment program involving mandated and free choice transfers has indicated that the traditional problems in implementing the program remain: the lack of clear program goals, with a commitment of resources specifically earmarked for realizing those goals. Some basic rethinking as to the direction and future of this program as noted above seems to us to be in order, with a clear and major commitment of resources needed if any significant change is to be accomplished in the level of success achieved.

APPENDIX A

DISTRICT PROGRAM GOALS

Project Location	Dist. #1 M; 1 Elementary School, 1 Junior High
Proposal Title	Guidance Services to Open Enrollment Pupils in JHS 104 M and Corrective Reading Services for Selected OE Students in PS 40 M and JHS 104 M
Budget	$36,150.
Program Goals	2 Guidance Counselors: to help orient OE pupils and their parents to the school and community; to help improve the self-image and raise aspirational levels of each OE child through educational, social and vocational guidance; to provide special guidance materials. 1 Reading Teacher: to help raise reading levels of selected OE children; to improve language arts skills.

Project Location	Dist. #2 M; 3 Elementary Schools
Proposal Title	Program to Raise Academic and Aspirational Levels of "Open Enrollment" Children in District 2
Budget	$31,398.
Program Goals	1 Reading Teacher, 6 Educational Assistants, 1 Family Assistant: to strengthen reading and mathematics abilities and skills through individual and small group teaching; to raise academic achievement and aspirational levels; to provide for integrated and socializing experiences; to raise self-image and improve personal competency; to develop closer relationships between the sending and receiving communities.

Project Location	Dist. #6 M; 6 Elementary Schools, 1 Junior High
Proposal Title	Inroads Into Integrated Interaction
Budget	$106,586.
Program Goals	4 Teachers, 3 Guidance Counselors, 3 Social Workers, 3 Laboratory Assistants, 18 School Aides, 3 Educational Assistants, 2 Parent Program Assistants, 1 Clerk Typist: to provide enrichment and remediation in Math, Science and Reading and image building; to foster better inter-group relations through mutual respect while working and studying together; to create fertile educational climate condusive to integrated interaction.

Project Location	Dist. #8 X; 2 Elementary Schools, 2 Junior High
Proposal Title	Program for Receiving Schools in Open Enrollment Program in District 8
Budget	$68,173.65
Program Goals	2 Teachers, 1 Guidance Counselor, 4 Educational Assistants, 5 School Aides, 1 Family Assistant, 2 Teacher Trainers; to raise the achievement level of OE pupils through increased individual and small group instruction; to improve the instruction of OE pupils by providing multi-ethnic textbooks and teaching materials on their interest and ability levels; to assist OE pupils to adjust to their new school by providing additional guidance services; to develop closer communication and better understanding between the school and the home.

Project Location	Dist. #9; 6 Elementary Schools, 1 Junior High
Proposal Title	Special Services for Receiving Schools in Officially Sponsored Program of Integration
Budget	$46,000.
Program Goals	2 Guidance Counselors, 1 School Aide: to foster integration and avoid or eliminate racial, social or linguistic isolation of open enrollment children; to offer additional educational and vocational guidance services; to use para-professionals from the target area to improve parental involvement and to assist the classroom teachers.

Project Location	Dist. #10; All Elementary and Junior High Schools in District that have Open Enrollment pupils
Proposal Title	The District 10 Auxiliary Services Program to Effect Improvement in the Learning of Open Enrollment Pupils
Budget	$219,000.
Program Goals	15 Teachers, 7 Family Workers, 1 Para-professional Trainer: to provide remedial work in reading; to provide enrichment and remediation in math and science; to provide guidance; to provide for a human relations approach to open enrollment in receiving schools; to provide for closer home-school liaison.

Project Location	Dist # 11; 16 Elementary Schools, 1 Intermediate, 2 Junior High, 2 High Schools
Proposal Title	Multi-Faceted Program for Open Enrollment Children
Budget	$348,000.
Program Goals	9 Classroom Teachers, 5 Guidance Counselors, 1 Bi-Lingual Teacher, 1 Psychologist, 1 Social Worker, 1 Secretary, 1 Attendance Teacher, 71 School Aides, 4 Family Assistants. Reading Counseling Teams will service one senior high school and ten elementary schools with 750 Open Enrollment children severely retarded in reading; will promote integration through the involvement of Open Enrollment parents and community parents; and will train classroom teachers in practices which will foster healthy integration in the classroom. The School Bus Aide Educational Program under the supervision of a District Bi-Lingual teacher is planned to bring into the receiving community parents of the Open Enrollment children so that closer ties are established between the two community groups, and to provide the bi-lingual children riding the buses with preparatory experiences which will facilitate their integration into the regular school program. The Secondary School Reading Resource Room is being organized so that the District Resource Staff can train the professional personnel and para-professional personnel to meet the needs of that portion of the Secondary School target population which either have bi-lingual backgrounds or are more than two years retarded in reading or will not meet reading requirement for H.S. Diploma. The Evening Guidance Clinic, conveniently located for the parents of Open Enrollment children, will serve to increase the participation of families from diverse cultural backgrounds in the overall educational process and to familiarize these parents with the educational needs of their children. The Computer Assisted Math Program, to be conducted by the District Math Coordinator, is planned to make after-school use of the Computer Program and the School Aides trained for this work, for the 6th and 7th and 9th grade Open-Enrollment children with computational deficiencies. Project Reentry aims to assist the 200 out-of-district secondary school students who are recent drop-outs to remain in or to return to school and to establish contact with the homes of these students in order to strengthen the parents' role in their education. Language Arts Materials Production Program is aimed at having school aides, trained by the

District Curriculum Coordinator and the District Audio-Visual Instruction Supervisor, prepare audio-visual instructional material, such as tapes, slides, etc., to use with small groups of Open Enrollment children who face learning frustrations because of specific language difficulties.

Project Location	Dist. #15; 4 Elementary Schools
Proposal Title	Helping the Open Enrollment Children of District 15 Through Remedial Reading, Music Enrichment, and Para-Professional Services
Budget	$30,225.
Program Goals	2 Teachers, 1 Teacher Aide, 1 Educational Assistant: to provide remedial reading instruction and music enrichment instruction; to help Open Enrollment pupils to adjust to the new school environment by using bus aides to accompany them on bus and helping them at lunch.

Project Location	Dist. #17; 1 High School
Proposal Title	Remediation for Open Enrolees at Erasmus Hall High School
Budget	$110,000.
Program Goals	6 Teachers, 1 Guidance Counselor: to improve reading ability; to improve ability to write English; to raise pupils' educational and vocational aspirations through guidance and counseling.

Project Location	Dist. #18; 7 Elementary Schools, 3 Junior High, 1 High School, District Office
Proposal Title	A Program for Open Enrollment Schools in an Integrated Setting
Budget	$311,000.
Program Goals	3 Corrective Reading Teachers, 5 Guidance Counselors, 4 Mathematics Teachers, 1 Speech Teacher, 1 Health Education Teacher: to raise the achievement level of in-coming pupils to foster integration in the schools of District 18; to conduct curricular and guidance activities in an integrated setting.

Project Location	Dist. #20; 9 Elementary Schools, 6 Junior High, 2 High Schools
Proposal Title	Guidance Services and Corrective Reading Services for Open Enrollment Children in District 20
Budget	$303,062.97
Program Goals	6 Guidance Counselors, 11 Corrective Reading Teachers: to improve reading ability; to raise educational and vocational aspirations through guidance and counseling; to assist pupils to make a satisfactory personal and social adjustment.

Project Location	District #21 K; 13 Elementary Schools, 2 Junior High, 1 High School
Proposal Title	Services Follow the Child
Budget	$232,000.
Program Goals	4 Guidance Counselors, 6.5 Corrective Reading Teachers, 4.5 Enrichment Teachers, 2 Educational Assistants: to deal with educational deprivation of incoming pupils; to upgrade academic needs as indicated, of Open Enrollment pupils; to provide for small group instruction for pupils with educational deficiencies; to improve personal-social adjustment and provide for educational and vocational appraisal and exploration; to provide for enriching experiences for pupils to improve their self-image and improve personal competency; to provide an on-going articulation program between the sending and receiving communities.

Project Location	Dist. #22; 7 Elementary Schools, 4 Junior High, 3 High Schools, District Office
Proposal Title	A Combined Intensive Reading Instruction, Guidance Services and Family Communication Program for Out of District Pupils in Selected Schools in District 22
Budget	$304,000.
Program Goals	7 Corrective Reading Teachers, 5 Guidance Counselors, 22 Educational Assistants, 9 Family Assistants: to raise the reading grade level of every out-of-district child to grade norms; to provide supervision on school buses for the safety of the children; to

establish communication between out-of-district parents and school in order to provide a better understanding of the parents and their role in the school program; to provide a coordinated team approach to help children needing both guidance and reading assistance; to provide augmented counseling services to children to help them to raise their own self-image and to understand more fully the advantages of extended education.

Project Location	District #23; 4 Elementary Schools, 2 Junior High Schools
Proposal Title	The Use of Small Group Teaching to Improve Educational Achievement
Budget	$61,050.
Program Goals	6 Teachers: to emphasize the importance of improving the reading level of the retarded reader who is the focal point of this program; to set up criteria for admission to the program, i.e., reading below grade level, under-achieving because of retardation, inadequate performance due to limited experience; to foster self-confidence in selected pupils by helping them meet with success through achievement; to provide enriching experiences; to foster integration by providing socializing experiences such as dramatics, choral speaking, assembly programs.

Project Location	Dist. #24 Q; 12 Elementary Schools, 1 Junior High School
Proposal Title	Increased Services for Educationally Disadvantaged Children in the Open Enrollment Program in District 24, Queens
Budget	$193,247.
Program Goals	6.6 Guidance Counselors, 6.6 Corrective Reading Teachers, 1 Teacher of English as a Second Language: to provide increased Guidance Services primarily to Open Enrollment children; to provide Open Enrollment retarded readers with increased diagnostic and corrective services; to assimilate children, learning English as a second language, into the continental North American environment as rapidly as possible by increasing their knowledge of local mores.

Project Location	Dist. #25; 6 Elementary Schools, 2 Junior High Schools
Proposal Title	Services for Educationally Deprived Children in the Integration Program in Dist. 25
Budget	$93,000.
Program Goals	4 Teachers, 1 Guidance Counselor, 2 Family Assistants, 2 Family Workers: to improve reading achievement of children from disadvantaged areas by providing specialized instruction needed to overcome reading disabilities; to promote better personal, social and school adjustment through the services of a guidance counselor; to develop better communication and cooperation between the newly enlarged community and the school.

Project Location	Dist. #26; 6 Elementary Schools, 1 Intermediate, 4 Junior High
Proposal Title	Providing Guidance Counseling and Corrective Reading for Pupils of This District
Budget	$173,000.
Program Goals	6 Guidance Counselors, 3 Corrective Reading Teachers, 5 School Aides: to provide remediation in reading that will help pupils realize their potential. To improve personal and social adjustment of pupils in the schools concerned; to provide needed services for pupils being bussed into this district from disadvantaged areas.

Project Location	District #27; 8 Elementary Schools, 2 Junior High Schools
Proposal Title	Open Enrollment Remediation Program
Budget	$138,450.
Program Goals	1 Guidance Counselor, 5 Teachers, 11 Educational Assistants: to reduce the educational disadvantages of the youngsters from economically deprived areas of our district and others who have the same problems; to provide them with the tools to better integrate themselves in the receiver schools, general activities and achievements.

Project Location	District #28; 2 Junior High Schools
Proposal Title	Improved Services for Educationally Disadvantaged Children in the Open Enrollment Program in District 28, Queens
Budget	$68,097.
Program Goals	3 Guidance Counselors, 1 Teacher: to provide individual and group counseling for personal and social adjustment; to provide educational and vocational programs; to provide parent counseling, parent education programs, and parent involvement in school activities; to increase the use of community agencies, and school services by referring students for a variety of needs; to provide remediation for academic retardation.

Project Location	District #29; 4 Elementary Schools, 1 Junior High School
Project Title	Open Enrollment Project for District 29
Budget	$89,100.
Program Goals	5 Regular Substitute Reading Teachers, 1 Guidance Counselor, 4 School Aides: to provide additional personnel and services for pupils from poverty areas who attend Elementary and Junior High Schools outside their designated areas. This project will provide services these pupils might receive had they attended schools in their own neighborhoods. The personnel and services would be directed towards meeting the above-mentioned needs as well as promoting the integration and acceptance of Open Enrollment pupils by improving the academic achievement of Open Enrollment pupils.

Project Location	District #30
Proposal Title	District 30--Proposal
Budget	$49,000.
Program Goals	7 Teachers, 3 Clerk Typists: to motivate the students of this target population to further education and training beyond high school; to stress the ever-broadening help available to the students in this target population in selection processes and financial assistance such as scholarships; to provide

field training for teachers to explore job opportunities for students of the target population; to promote pupil growth and development between Open Enrollment students and resident students.

APPENDIX B

INSTRUMENTS

Principal's Questionnaire B1

Interview Guide - District Reading Supervisor B4

Individual Lesson Observation Report - Remedial Reading B10

Questionnaire for Remedial Reading Teacher B19

Questionnaire for Classroom Teacher B23

Interview Guide - District Guidance Coordinator B26

Questionnaire for Guidance Counselors B32

Letter to Principals of Open Enrollment Schools B38

Principal's Questionnaire B39

Evaluation of the Open Enrollment Program B46

Center for Urban Education

Open Enrollment Program

PRINCIPAL'S QUESTIONNAIRE

District:__________ School:__________ Borough:__________ Date:__________

Form completed by: Name:____________________ Position__________

Telephone Number:________________

1. Please indicate if the out-of-district pupils assigned to your school receiving Open Enrollment services are participating on a free choice transfer basis or if the transfers were mandated.

   a. All of the transferred pupils are participating through free choice
   b. All of the pupil transfers were mandated
   c. Some of the transfers were free choice and some were mandated

   If you checked "c", how many pupils are in each category?

   __________free choice transfers __________ mandated transfers

   d. Don't know

2. Please list the additional positions and services your school has received as a result of the district proposal:

Position	Date Position Assigned to Your School	Date Position Filled	Name of Person Assigned to Position
Professional			

(Continue on back if more space is needed)

Para Professional			

Supplies, equipment, teaching materials **Description**

3. **Please indicate any difficulties you had filling the following positions and briefly describe these difficulties: If you had no difficulties filling a position, please write "None."**

Corrective reading

Math

Guidance

Other (Science, Health, Music, Art, Teaching English as a Second Language)

Para Professionals

4. Please list the name of the person in your school to contact in order to make an appointment to observe on-going activities:

Name:________________________ Phone:____________________

5. Please list the activities, grades, classes, meeting times, and the number of children being served as part of your open enrollment program.

ACTIVITY	GRADE(List each instructional group within each grade separately)	Meeting Time Day	Meeting Time Hour	No. of O E Children Involved
Corrective Reading:				
Math:				
Guidance: (If individual guidance, please indicate availability of guidance counselor)				
Science:				
Health:				
English as Second Language:				
Other (Specify)				

Center for Urban Education

Open Enrollment

INTERVIEW GUIDE - DISTRICT READING SUPERVISOR

Supervisor________________________ Date____________________________

District__________________________ Borough_______ No. of Schools in

District________________________

We'd like to get some idea of how reading instruction is being supervised for Open Enrollment pupils in your district. First I'd like to ask you a few questions that we are asking all reading supervisors with Open Enrollment pupils in their district. Then, since you are more familiar with your situation, we'd appreciate hearing about any other matters that you think should be included in evaluating this program.

1. As you understand it, what is the purpose of the OE program?

2. Have you received any guidelines from the Board of Education relating to the purpose of OE and the services to be given these pupils?

    1. Yes
    2. No
    3. No, because ours is a decentralized program. (Probe for details)

3. How many corrective reading teachers are under your supervision?

    ____

4. How many of these teachers are assigned to work specifically with OE pupils?__________

5.a) How is the retardation level determined for the OE pupil? (Probes: achievement tests? Diagnostic tests (perceptual, motor? How is ability or potential measured if discrepancy between ability and achievement scores is basis of retardation.)

b) If achievement tests only: How is cause of reading problem diagnosed?

6. What do you believe to be the main causes of reading retardation in OE pupils in your district?

Cause	Per Cent of Pupils In Category

7. What kind of records are kept for OE pupils in the corrective reading program?

8. Who is responsible for these records?

    1. Classroom teacher
    2. Reading teacher
    3. School psychologist
    4. Other

9. Do you think this district's remedial reading program is adequate for the needs of OE pupils?

    1. Sufficient properly trained personnel?

    2. Other personnel?

    3. Are textbooks and curriculum materials appropriate?

    4. Is the program adequate for resident pupils?

10. Has the transfer of the OE pupils to your district created any new or unique problems for your department?

11. Does your remedial reading program for OE pupils involve parents in any way?

12. How do teachers in your district communicate with parents of OE pupils?

13.a) Is anything being done to coordinate the remedial reading instruction with classroom instruction?

b) Is it considered important to coordinate the two?

c) Is it left to the discretion of individual classroom teachers and reading teachers?

14.a) Are there any plans for evaluating reading achievement for OE pupils in this district?

b) If YES, what will evaluation consist of?

c) Who is supervising the evaluation?

15. On the average, how much change do you think will result for the typical Open Enrollment pupil participating in the remedial reading classes? (show card)

	Per cent in each Category
1. Marked progress	
2. Slight progress	
3. No change	
4. Slightly worse	
5. Appreciably worse	

16. How does this compare with the progress of resident pupils participating in remedial reading classes?

17. What effect - in terms of reading achievement - will participating in OE have on the other OE pupils (those not in remedial reading program?)

18. In your opinion, what effect will the OE program have on the resident pupils?

19.a) Has the Board of Education sponsored any workshops or conferences for supervisors and teachers on treating reading problems of disadvantaged children?

1. Yes
2. No

b) If YES: did you attend any of them?

1. Yes
2. No

c) If YES: were they helpful to you?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Why

d) If YES: were they helpful to teachers?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Why

e) If NO: do you think such workshops or conferences would be helpful?

20. Have you arranged any workshops or conferences for the reading teachers in your district on treating reading problems of disadvantaged children?

21. Have you had any special training in teaching reading to disadvantaged children?

22.a) Is there a consultant available to assist reading teachers in treating special reading problems?

1. Yes
2. No

b) If YES: How are consultations arranged?

c) With whom are consultations arranged?

23.a) What about classroom teachers? Is anyone available to help them with reading problems?

1. Yes
2. No

b) If YES: Who arranges consultations?

24.a) What proportion of reading teachers in your program have you been able to observe since school began?

b) How many do you think you will have been able to observe by the end of the school year?

25.a) Who hires the reading teachers in your district?

b) Who evaluates them?

26. Who selects the textbooks and curriculum materials for remedial reading classes? (Probes: Are reading teachers involved in selection?)

27.a) Who selects textbooks and reading materials for regular classrooms?

b) Are teachers involved?

c) Have any special texts been ordered for OE pupils not in remedial reading classes?

28. How adequate is your textbook and materials budget to meet the needs of the OE pupils?

29. Which educational journals do you subscribe to?

30. Do you have any recommendations to make for the OE program in the future?

31. Is there anything further you would like to talk about that hasn't been covered by these questions?

Center for Urban Education

Open Enrollment

INDIVIDUAL LESSON OBSERVATION REPORT

REMEDIAL READING

School ______________ Borough ___________ Class ______ Date ____________

Teacher's Name _______________________ Sex _________ Observer ______________

Length of Observation _____________________________

1. Number of children in group __________ Number of children absent __________

2. Is group a homogeneousgroup?

   1. Yes
   2. No

3. a) Were pupils divided into more than one instruction group?

Number of Groups		Number of Pupils in Each Group		
1.	2	(A)	(B)	
2.	3	(A)	(B)	(C)
3.	4 or more			

   b) Describe what was being taught to each individual or group of children.

4. Did the teacher seem partial to some pupils at one level of ability rather than another?

   1. No
   2. Yes, to the more able
   3. Yes, to the less able

5. What was the length of this lesson? ____________________________

6. Was the entire lesson seen?

    1. Yes
    2. No, I missed the beginning
    3. No, I missed the end

7. How typical do you think this lesson was of normal functioning in this group?

    1. Completely typical
    2. Reasonable approximation
    3. Atypical. Explain:

8. What amount of planning was evident in this lesson?

    1. Exceptionally well planned
    2. Well planned
    3. Showed some evidence of planning
    4. Showed few or no signs of planning

9. Was the lesson content appropriate to the reading problems of the children?

    1. For every or almost every child
    2. For more than half the group
    3. About half the group
    4. One or two pupils
    5. None

10. What instructional materials and/or devices were used or evident for use in this particular classroom? (Explain and describe as fully as possible) If none go to question 19.

11. Were the materials and/or devices used specifically related to the particular skill or ability in which the child is deficient?

    1. Yes
    2. No

    (Explain basis for answer)

12. Do materials provide motivation to read?

    1. For all or almost every pupil
    2. For more than half the group
    3. For half the group
    4. For less than half the group
    5. For one or two pupils
    6. None

13. Please check all of the following materials used or displayed in the classroom:

    1. Basic reader
    2. Basic reader workbooks
    3. Picture cards
    4. Reading games
    5. Skill workbooks
    6. Trade books
    7. Experiential reading
    8. Reading laboratories
    9. Pacers
    10. Quick flash devices
    11. Tape recorder
    12. Newspapers
    13. Other

14. Were reading materials displayed so as to stimulate interest of pupils?

    1. Displayed in an exceptionally interesting manner
    2. Displayed but not very provocative
    3. Poorly displayed
    4. No display

15. Do the methods provide for the development of a systematic sequence of skills?

    1. For every or almost every child
    2. For more than half the group
    3. About half the group
    4. Less than half the group
    5. One or two pupils
    6. None

16. To what extent did this lesson/or lessons refer to earlier material in this remedial class?

1. Considerable reference to previous lessons
2. Some reference to previous lessons
3. No reference to previous lessons
4. Not relevant. Explain:

17. To what extent did this lesson lay a foundation for future lessons in this remedial class?

1. Considerable possibility for continuity
2. Some opportunity for continuity
3. Little or no possibility for continuity
4. Not relevant. Explain:

18. To what extent did the lesson lay a foundation for independent work in this remedial class?

1. Considerable possibility for independent work
2. Some possibility for independent work
3. Little or no possibility for independent work
4. Not relevant. Explain:

19. To what extent did the teacher refer to regular class work?

1. A great deal
2. Some
3. None

20. How would you rate the amount of material covered to date keeping in mind the fact that there has been a disruption of school because of the teachers' strike and the program has been in effect less than three months?

1. Outstanding
2. Better than average
3. Average
4. Below average
5. Extremely poor
6. Not relevant. Explain:

21. How would you rate the depth of instruction?

    1. Outstanding
    2. Better than average
    3. Average
    4. Below average
    5. Extremely poor
    6. Not relevant. Explain:

22. How many children showed interest and enthusiasm?

    1. Every or almost every child
    2. More than half the children
    3. Half the children
    4. Fewer than half the children
    5. Very few or no children
    6. Not relevant. Explain:

23. How many children volunteered in response to teacher questions?

    1. Every or almost every child
    2. More than half the children
    3. Half the children
    4. Fewer than half the children
    5. Very few or no children
    6. Teacher asked few or no questions, although material or lesson made questioning possible.
    7. Material did not lend itself to questions

24. How many children raised questions?

    1. Every or almost every child
    2. More than half the children
    3. Half the children
    4. Fewer than half the children
    5. Very few or no children
    6. Children asked few, although material or lesson made questioning possible.
    7. Material did not lend itself to questions.

25. How would you describe the teacher's overall handling of the children's questions?

    1. Questions were welcomed and built on
    2. Questions were answered cursorily
    3. Questions were ignored
    4. Opportunity for questions was there, but few or none were asked. Why?

    5. Material did not lend itself to questions.

26. What was the overall participation of the children?

    1. Every or almost every child was actively involved
    2. More than half participated
    3. About half participated
    4. Fewer than half participated
    5. Very few or none participated
    6. Not relevant.
       Explain:

27. What was the children's general understanding of the teacher's spoken words?

    1. Every or almost every child understood fully
    2. More than half understood
    3. About half the children understood fully
    4. Fewer than half the children understood
    5. Very few or no children understood

28. How would you describe the teacher's verbal communication with Non-English speaking children?

    1. Communicates with ease
    2. Communicates with some difficulty
    3. Communicates with great difficulty
    4. Not relevant. Explain

29. How would you describe the overall Teacher-Pupil relationship?

    1. Teacher seems to get along well with all or almost all the pupils.
    2. Teacher seems to get along well with more than half the pupils, ignoring the rest.
    3. Teacher seems to get along well with more than half the pupils, and shows an overt distaste for some.
    4. Teacher seems to get along well with about half the pupils.
    5. Teacher seems to get along well with fewer than half the pupils.
    6. Teacher seems to get along well with very few or none of the pupils.

30. How would you rate the overall quality of instruction?

    1. Outstanding
    2. Better than average
    3. Average
    4. Below average
    5. Extremely poor

31. Was this room primarily set up for remedial reading classes?

    1. Yes
    2. No
    3. Explain your rating;

32. How would you rate the appearance of the room?

    1. Extremely attractive
    2. Of greater than average attractiveness
    3. Average
    4. Less than average attractiveness
    5. Unattractive
    6. Additional observations:

33. How would you describe the group atmosphere in terms of discipline and in terms of warmth?

    1. Undisciplined and warm
    2. Undisciplined and cold
    3. Disciplined yet congenial or warm
    4. Disciplined and cold
    5. Overdisciplined yet warm
    6. Overdisciplined and cold

34. Most of the children in this group seemed:

    1. Relaxed
    2. Somewhat restrained
    3. Inhibited

35. Evaluation was generally: (circle all that apply)

    1. Omitted
    2. Critical or negative
    3. Not done in terms of criteria
    4. Not supported by suggestions for improvement
    5. Included
    6. Encouraging or positive
    7. Done in terms of criteria
    8. Supported by suggestions for improvement

36. The teacher's expectations seemed:

    1. High for the pupils in this group
    2. Low for the pupils in this group
    3. Realistic for the group
    4. The teacher did not indicate any expectations for the pupils. Explain a rating of "1" or "2"

37. The teacher made an attempt to praise

    1. All or almost every pupil
    2. About half
    3. Only a few
    4. None

38. Describe any incidents that occurred during the lesson that interfered with teaching and how the teacher handled these incidents:

39. In your opinion what effect will continued participation in this type of **remedial group have** on the reading achievement of these pupils? (**Specify the proportion** of the group that you would expect in **each category**)

	Per cent of group in each category
1. Marked progress	
2. Slight progress	
3. No change	
4. Slightly worse	
5. Appreciably worse	
Total	100%

Additional comments:

Center for Urban Education

Open Enrollment

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR REMEDIAL READING TEACHER

Teacher________________________________ Date______________________

School__________________ Borough ___________ District______________

We would appreciate your answering these questions relating to remedial reading for Open Enrollment pupils in your school. Incidentally, we will be asking the regular classroom teachers to answer similar questions.

1. How often do you consult with or discuss pupil progress with the classroom teachers?

    1. About once a week
    2. About twice a month
    3. Once a month
    4. About twice a year
    5. Never Why?

    6. Other

2. If you do consult with the classroom teacher, what do you usually discuss? (circle all that apply)

    1. Selection of appropriate materials for pupils in class
    2. Ways to relate remedial instruction to classroom work
    3. Pupil progress
    4. Suggestions to help pupils not receiving remedial instruction
    5. Other (specify)

3. To what extent is there a consistent relationship between the work done in the remedial class and the regular class?

    1. Highly consistent relationship between remedial instruction and class work
    2. Consistent relationship between remedial instruction and class work
    3. Somewhat consistent relationship
    4. Not consistent

4. How are the Open Enrollment pupils selected for the remedial reading program?

   1. Principal makes referrals
   2. Classroom teacher makes referrals
   3. School psychologist makes referrals
   4. Other (specify)

5.a)Were the children given any diagnostic tests?

   1. No
   2. Yes

  b)If YES, which ones?

6. Are you able to schedule regular conferences with parents?

   1. No. Why?

   2. Yes

7.a)If NO to question 6: Do parents ever request conferences with you?

   1. No
   2. Yes

  b)If YES, are you able to schedule conferences with these parents?

8. Do you think you as a teacher are able to handle the educational needs of the Open Enrollment pupils?

   1. Yes Why?

   2. No Why?

9. On the average, how much change have you seen in the pupils in this remedial reading class this year?

    1. Marked progress
    2. Slight progress
    3. No change
    4. Slightly worse
    5. Appreciably worse

10. In your opinion, what effect does participation in the Open Enrollment Program have on the Open Enrollment pupils?

11. In your opinion, what effect does the Open Enrollment Program have on the resident pupils?

12. To what extent do you have the curriculum materials that you need for the Open Enrollment pupils?

    1. Fully
    2. Most
    3. Few
    4. None

13. If you answered FEW or NO materials for Open Enrollment pupils, were any ordered?

    1. Yes
    2. No
    3. Don't know

14. How often have your classes been observed by your district reading supervisor?

15. Have you taken any special courses in teaching remedial reading?

    1. No
    2. Yes (please list course titles)

16. Have you taken any special courses in teaching disadvantaged children?

    1. No
    2. Yes (please list course titles)

THANK YOU

Center for Urban Education

Open Enrollment

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR CLASSROOM TEACHER

Teacher____ Date__________________

School__________________ Borough ___________ District _________________

Number of Open Enrollment pupils in your class___________

We would appreciate your answering these questions relating to Open Enrollment pupils in your class. Incidentally, we have asked the remedial reading teacher to answer similar questions.

1. How often do you consult with or discuss pupil progress with the remedial reading teacher?

   1. About once a week
   2. About twice a month
   3. Once a month
   4. About twice a year
   5. Never Why?

   6. Other

2. If you do consult with the remedial reading teacher, what do you usually discuss? (circle all that apply)

   1. Selection of appropriate materials for pupils in class
   2. Ways to relate remedial instruction to classroom work
   3. Pupil progress
   4. Suggestions to help pupils not receiving remedial instruction
   5. Other (specify)

3. To what extent is there a consistent relationship between the work done in the remedial class and your class?

   1. Highly consistent relationship between remedial instruction and class work
   2. Consistent relationship between remedial instruction and class work
   3. Somewhat consistent relationship
   4. Not consistent

4. Do you think you as a teacher are able to handle the educational needs of the Open Enrollment pupils?

   1. Yes Why?

   2. No Why?

5.a)How many conferences have you been able to schedule with the parents of the Open Enrollment children in your class?

   1. One
   2. Two to five
   3. More than five
   4. None

   b)If NONE, why?

6. How do you and other staff members communicate with the parents of the Open Enrollment pupils?

7. On the average, how much change have you seen in the pupils participating in the remedial reading class this year?

   1. Marked progress
   2. Slight progress
   3. No change
   4. Slightly worse
   5. Appreciably worse

8. In your opinion, what effect does participating in the Open Enrollment Program have on the Open Enrollment pupils?

9. In your opinion, what effect does the Open Enrollment Program have on the resident pupils?

10. To what extent do you have the curriculum materials that you need for the Open Enrollment pupils?

    1. Fully
    2. Most
    3. Few
    4. None

11. If you have few or no materials for Open Enrollment pupils, were any ordered?

    1. Yes
    2. No
    3. Don't know

Center for Urban Education

Open Enrollment

INTERVIEW GUIDE - DISTRICT GUIDANCE COORDINATOR

Coordinator or Supervisor______________ School__________ District _______

No. of Elem. Schools____________ No. of Secondary Schools________________

Total Enrollment Elem.__________ Total Enrollment Secondary______________

No. of OE Pupils Elem.__________ No. of OE Pupils Secondary______________

We'd like to get some idea of how guidance is being supervised for OE pupils in your district. First, I'd like to ask you a few questions that we are asking all guidance coordinators or supervisors with OE pupils in their district. Then, since you are more familiar with your situation, we'd appreciate hearing about any other aspect of the program that you think we should know to fully evaluate this program.

1. As you understand it, what is the overall purpose of the OE program?

2. What is the goal of the guidance program for OE pupils in your district?

3. Were you involved in preparing this district's OE proposal this year?

   A. Yes. How?

   B. No.

4. Do you believe you should have been involved?

   A. Yes. Why?

   B. No

5. Have you seen the final proposal?

   A. Yes.

   B. No.

6. Have you seen OE proposals for previous years?

   A. Yes.

   B. No.

7. Have you received any guidelines from the Board of Education relating to the purpose of OE and the services to given these pupils?

   A. Yes.

   B. No.

8. How many school psychologists and/or guidance counselors in this district are under your direct supervision or guidance?

9. How many of these guidance counselors are assigned to work specifically with OE pupils?

10. Does your guidance program provide individual or group counseling?

    A. Individual

    B. Group. How many pupils in groups?

    C. Both

11. Does it differ on elementary and secondary levels?

12. What is the basis for selection of pupils to participate in guidance program?

13. Who determines which OE pupils will participate in the group or individual guidance program?

14. From your experience and what you have learned from your district's guidance counselors, what seem to be the main problems in working with OE pupils in guidance programs?

15. What do you think are the main causes of the referred pupils' problems? (if not covered: cause of academic retardation?)

16. What kind of records are kept for OE pupils participating in regular guidance program?

17. Are any additional records kept for OE pupils in the program?

18. Does the principal or other supervisor in the school review these records at the end of the year with the guidance counselor?

    A. Yes.

    B. No.

19. Does the guidance counselor and principal have adequate time for this?

    A. Yes.

    B. No.

20. Who is responsible for seeing that adequate records are kept?

21. Do you think he/she has enough time to do this properly?

22. Do the guidance counselors meet with OE parents?

23. How are parents contacted?

24. Do you have any idea how many OE parents have responded to requests to attend conferences with guidance counselors?

25. If low, what do you think is the reason?

26. Can guidance counselors refer OE pupils to non-school agencies in this district for services not available within the school?

    A. Yes. Which ones?

    B. No.

27. Can your guidance counselors refer pupils to agencies in their sending district for services not available with the school or this district?

28. How adequately can you serve the needs of the OE pupils with your present resources:

    A. completely
    B. mostly
    C. about 50%
    D. slightly
    E. not at all

29. If "b" "c" "d" or "e" why not completely?

30. Is it adequate for the needs of resident pupils?

31. For what proportion of OE pupils do you think the curriculum offered in OE schools is appropriate?

    A. appropriate for all
    B. appropriate for most
    C. appropriate for a few
    D. inappropriate

32. What factors are usually operating when your counselors are successful in helping OE pupils?

33. Has the transfer of the OE pupils to your district created any new or unique problems for your department?

34. Are there any plans for evaluating the effectiveness of your guidance program for OE pupils?

    A. Yes. What will evaluation consist of?

    B. Who supervises?

35. What effect do you think participation in OE will have on OE children as a group?

    A. re: Attitude and Self-concept

    B. re: Behavior

    C. re: Achievement

36. What effect do you think the OE program has on resident pupils?

    A. re: Attitude and Self-concept

    B. re: Behavior

    C. re: Achievement

37. Do you think OE pupils in your district have a problem competing academically with resident pupils?

38. Has the Board of Education sponsored any workshops or conferences for supervisors and counselors on the problems of disadvantaged children?

    A. Yes.

    B. No.

a)	If YES, did you attend any of them?	Yes.	No.
b)	Were they helpful to you?	Yes.	No.
c)	Were they helpful to guidance counselors?	Yes.	No.

39. If NO, do you think such workshops or conferences would be helpful?

    A. Yes.

    B. No.

40. Have you arranged any workshops or conferences on the problems of disadvantaged children for counselors in your own district?

    A. Yes.

    B. No.

41. A. Who hires guidance counselors in your district?

    B. Who supervises guidance counselors in your district?

    C. Who evaluates guidance counselors in your district?

42. Is the reviewing of guidance records in each school one of your responsibilities?

43. Where you a guidance counselor before becoming a supervisor/ or coordinator?

44. For how many years?

45. How much of this was spent working with disadvantaged children?

46. At what age level?

47. What degrees do you hold?

A. B.A.
B. M.A.
C. Ph.D.

48. What was the major field of your undergraduate study?

49. What was the major field of your graduate study?

50. Do you have a budget for subscriptions to professional journals?

A. Yes. Which ones do you subscribe to?

B. No.

51. Do you subscribe to any professional journals on your own?

A. Yes. Which ones?

B. No.

52. Do you have any recommendations to make for the OE program in the future?

53. Is there anything we have not covered that you believe should be considered in the evaluation of this year's OE program?

Center for Urban Education

Open Enrollment Program

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR GUIDANCE COUNSELORS

Counselor__________________________ School__________ District #_______ Borough_______

1. As you understand it, what is the overall purpose of the Open Enrollment program?

2. Have you seen this school district's proposal for services for Open Enrollment pupils?

   A. Yes
   B. No

3. If the answer to question 2 is NO, do you know anything about the proposal?

   A. Yes (explain)
   B. No

4. Have you received any information from the principal or guidance coordinator on the guidance services to be provided to Open Enrollment pupils?

   A. Yes
      i. From principal
      ii. From guidance coordinator
   B. No

5. What are usually the reasons for referrals of Open Enrollment pupils?

   A. Behavioral problems
   B. Academic problems
   C. Both A and B
   D. Health
   E. Other (specify)

6. What do you think are the main causes of the referred Open Enrollment pupils' problems?

7. What does your guidance program involve for the Open Enrollment pupils?

8. If your program includes group guidance, do counselors work with groups of Open Enrollment pupils only or with entire classes of Open Enrollment and resident pupils?

   A. Groups of Open Enrollment only
   B. Groups with Open Enrollment and Resident pupils
   C. Both "A" and "B"

9. What is basis for selection of Open Enrollment pupils for group or individual guidance?

10a. For how many Open Enrollment pupils have you provided counseling so far this year?

10b. How many of these Open Enrollment pupils are boys?

11. For how many resident pupils have you provided counseling this year?

12. How often do you usually see each pupil?

13. How many sessions does each pupil average (for the year)?

14. What kind of records are kept for pupils participating in regular guidance programs?

15. What percent of your time is spent working with children in your guidance capacity?

16. What percent of your time is spent on other school functions? (What?)

17. Is there any one in the school specifically responsible for reviewing the records of individual Open Enrollment pupils in the guidance program?

A. Yes　　C. Who?
B. No

18. Is this review made on a regular basis or done only in cases of severe problems?

19. How adequately can you serve the needs of the Open Enrollment pupils with your present resources?

A. Completely
B. Mostly
C. About 50%
D. Slightly
E. Not at all

20. If "B," "C," "D" or "E," why not completely?

21. How successful have you been in arranging conferences with parents of Open Enrollment pupils? (Please explain if you have not been successful in seeing parents.)

22. Do you have your own phone?

A. Yes　　B. No

23. In general, how are Open Enrollment pupils in guidance program responding?

24. What effect do you think participation in Open Enrollment will have on Open Enrollment children (as a group)?

A. re: Attitude and self-concept

B. re: Behavior

C. re: Achievement

25. What effect do you think the Open Enrollment program has on resident pupils?

A. re: Attitude and self-concept

B. re: Behavior

C. re: Achievement

26. Is your guidance program coordinated with classroom teaching in any way?

A. Yes
B. No
C. If yes, how?

27. Do classroom teachers have time for conferences with you about the Open Enrollment pupils?

A. Yes B. No

28. Do you think Open Enrollment pupils in this school have a problem competing academically with resident pupils?

A. Yes B. No

29. For what proportion of Open Enrollment pupils is the academic program in this school appropriate?

A. Appropriate for all
B. Appropriate for most
C. Appropriate for some
D. Appropriate for few
E. Inappropriate

30. If INAPPROPRIATE for some, few or all--why?

31. Have you ever discussed special teaching approaches for Open Enrollment pupils with classroom teachers?

A. Yes B. No

32. If NO--have you ever wanted to?

A. Yes B. No

33. What stopped you?

34. If YES--were teachers usually cooperative?

A. Yes B. No

35. Has the transfer of the Open Enrollment pupils to your school created any new or unique problems for you in your professional role? (Please explain.)

A. No
B. Yes (please explain)

36. Have you attended any workshops or conferences for guidance counselors on the problems of disadvantaged children?

A. Yes B. No C. Were they helpful?

37. When you refer pupils to out of school agencies, how long do pupils usually have to wait before being seen by the agency?

Now some questions about you.

38. What kind of license do you have?

39. For how many years have you been a guidance counselor? _______ years.

40. How many years have you been in this school? _______ years.

41. How many years have you been in this school as a guidance counselor? _______ years.

42. For how many years did you teach before becoming a guidance counselor? _____ years.

43. What degrees do you hold?

	Major field	
A. B.A.	__________	
B. M.A.	__________	
C. Have you taken graduate courses?	Yes	No

44. Can you order subscriptions to professional journals for this school library or your office?

A. Yes B. No

If YES--which ones?

45. Do you subscribe to any on your own?

A. Yes B. No

If YES--which ones?

46. Do you have any recommendations to make for the Open Enrollment program for the future?

47. Is there anything we have not covered that you believe should be considered in the evaluation of this year's Open Enrollment program?

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION

TO: Principals of Open Enrollment Schools

FROM: Dr. David J. Fox and Mrs. Colleen Stewart,
Co-Chairmen Open Enrollment Evaluation

RE: Title I Evaluation of Decentralized Open Enrollment Programs

We would like to thank you for the cooperation which you have given the staff involved in this evaluation. One last request is for the opinions and comments of those people who play a very significant role in this program. We are enclosing a questionnaire which we hope you will return as soon as possible. Please do not feel inhibited by the form of the questionnaire. If you have additional comments or suggestions concerning the Open Enrollment program please feel free to include them. The data from these questionnaires will of course be analyzed anonymously.

Center for Urban Education

Open Enrollment

PRINCIPAL'S QUESTIONNAIRE

School #______ District #_____ Borough ______________ Date __________

Length of time you have served as a principal_________________________

Length of time principal of this school ___________________________

1. To what extent is your staff adequate for meeting the needs of all of the children in your school?
   1. Fully
   2. Generally, but not fully
   3. Somewhat
   4. Very little
   5. Explanation and/or comment ________________________________

2. To what extent is your staff adequate for meeting the needs of the open enrollment children?
   1. Fully
   2. Generally, but not fully
   3. Somewhat
   4. Very little
   5. Explanation and/or comment ________________________________

3. To what extent is your staff adequate for meeting the needs of the children who have been transferred by mandate to your school?
   1. Fully
   2. Generally, but not fully
   3. Somewhat
   4. Very little
   5. Explanation and/or comment ________________________________

4. Please comment about any problems which you have had in attempting to provide remedial reading help to all of the children who need it.

5. In your opinion what is the main cause of reading retardation for the children in your school.

6. To what extent are you satisfied with the coordination of remedial reading activities with the regular classroom work?

   1. Fully
   2. Generally
   3. Somewhat
   4. Not at all

   If you answered 3 or 4 what do you believe are the reasons for any lack of coordination.

7. In your opinion what needs to be done to better prepare teachers to teach reading?

8. What is done in your school to help teachers improve their skills in the teaching of reading?

9. Have you done specific things to bring the Open Enrollment parents into communication with the teachers and other parents?

   1. If YES, please indicate what you have done.

   2. If NOT, please explain why not.

10. **Are you using any multi-ethnic materials?**

    1. If NO, please explain why not.

    2a. If YES, please specify

    b. How successful are they?

11. If YES to the above question, with whom do you use these materials?

    1. Open Enrollment children only
    2. Open Enrollment children predominantly
    3. Equally often with all children

12. For each of the seven areas below, please indicate any differences you have noted between the children who come under the free choice plan and those who come under mandate. If you have noted no difference, or have had no opportunity for comparison, indicate this with a check in the appropriate column.

Area	I have noted no difference	No opportunity to compare	I have noted a difference as indicated below
1. Attendance			
2. Reading			
3. Arithmetic			
4. Motivation			
5. Behavior			
6. Parental Interest			
7. Social Status			

13. Please comment on the community response to the presence of the Open Enrollment children in your school.

14. In your opinion what effect has the Open Enrollment program had on the resident children in each of the five areas below?

Area	No Effect	An Effect as Indicated
1. Attendance		
2. Reading		
3. Arithmetic		
4. Motivation		
5. Behavior		

15. How would you define the role of the guidance counselor?

16. To what extent has your guidance staff been able to fulfill the role as defined above?

    1. Fully
    2. Generally, but not fully
    3. Somewhat
    4. Very little
    5. Explanation and/or comment ______________________________

17. What type of guidance is being done in your school? (Check ALL which apply)

_____ 1. Individual

_____ 2. Group

_____ 3. Preventive

_____ 4. Problem oriented

5. Additional comment ______________________________

18. What improvements would you like to see in the guidance program in your school?

19. Approximately how many children are receiving guidance services?

1. Resident _____

2. Open Enrollment _____

3. Mandated _____

20. Please indicate below your opinion of the paraprofessional program in your school.

		If some, rating of performance				
Type of Service	None	Excellent	Good	Fair	Weak	Poor
1. Family workers						
2. Educational Aides						
3. Educational Assistants						

21. **What is your candid opinion on the worth of the Open Enrollment program as it has been conducted through 1968 on a centralized basis?**

22. **What is your candid opinion on the value of the Open Enrollment program as it has thus far been conducted on a decentralized basis?**

23. As you know, teachers have to concern themselves with many different types of things in their jobs. However, some teachers emphasize certain things more than others. Which type of teacher do you feel would be best for the following types of children? Would any type be unsuccessful?

Teacher Types

Teacher #1	This teacher is most concerned with maintaining discipline, seeing that students work hard, and teaching them to follow directions.
Teacher #2	This teacher feels it is most important that students know their subject matter well, and that he (she) cover the material thoroughly and test their progress regularly.
Teacher #3	This teacher stresses making the class interesting and encourages students to be creative and figure things out for themselves.

Type of child	Type of Teacher Considered Best (Please circle one)			Type of Teacher Likely to be Unsuccessful (Please circle one)		
1. Open Enrollment children who are not experiencing academic retardation.	1	2	3	1	2	3
2. Resident children who are not experiencing academic retardation.	1	2	3	1	2	3
3. Open Enrollment children who are experiencing academic retardation.	1	2	3	1	2	3
4. Resident children who are experiencing academic retardation.	1	2	3	1	2	3

Center for Urban Education

Open Enrollment

EVALUATION OF THE OPEN ENROLLMENT PROGRAM

School #________ District #_________ Borough _________ Telephone #_____________

1. **Nature of Activity** **Day** **Hour**

____

____

2. **Number of Children Involved: A. Open Enrollment___________ B. Other_______**

3. **Professional Personnel Involved and Their Area:**

____

____

4. **Number of Paraprofessionals Involved and Their Area:**

____

____

5. **Number of Parents Involved and Their Area:**

____

____

6. **Describe Objectives of Activities:**

____

____

7. **Person We Should Contact for Further Information on This Activity:**

____

____

8. **If we include a reference to this activity in our report, do you wish your school identified?**

Circle one: YES NO

9. **Person completing this form:**

Name____________________________________

Position__________________________________

APPENDIX C

FIELD OBSERVATIONS OF SOME SUCCESSFUL PROGRAMS AS DETERMINED BY PRINCIPALS AND DISTRICT OFFICE PERSONNEL

A. SCHOOL A

The school, erected in 1948, is typically middle class. Its neighborhood is one of multiple dwellings (duplexes and one-family homes). It appeared to the observer to be lower middle class. The building was well kept; evidences of good equipment and teaching facilities and materials were to be seen in classrooms, in the library, and throughout the school in general.

There is a full-time counselor on duty. She seemed committed to all children's healthful growth. She emphasized the factor of "distance" as a hindrance to face-to-face contacts with parents, although she reported "excellent results" in some cases and "little success" in others. The counselor made no claim for significant change in OE children as a whole. "It varies," she said, "from child to child." The family worker (who is a black woman) and who has been on the staff only this year, is reported by both principal and counselor as proving to have excellent potential and has already proved to be a good link between the family and the school.

There was little evidence in the school of materials related to black and Puerto Rican culture. Nor was there in the interviews with the principal and counselor evidence of awareness of the need to help OE children develop improved self-images through the use of models: teachers, aides, personnel, or of materials related to multi-ethnic content. No black faces except those of the children were seen on the premises.

The OE children were scattered throughout classes, but in three situations they sat in clusters together. In the lunchroom, on the playgrounds, in the halls, black children were clustered together. There were observed many instances of "acting out" by OE children. Again and again, during class times, pairs of OE children were seen in the halls going to the bathrooms or standing outside their classroom doors, or apparently going on errands. There was, it seemed to the observer, an unusual amount of noise making, some fighting, and deliberate clowning by the OE children. On the playground when a teacher brought from a building a number of jumping ropes, three O.E. girls ran to her, grabbed them from her, and distributed them as they wished, keeping most of them for themselves. The teacher seemed unable to stop them. In the office, two OE boys who had had a fight on the playground stood around for a long time with no attention paid to them. It was noon, and only one clerk was on duty in the office. The observer talked with the boys; they were subdued, shy, and introverted. There seemed to the observer to be an inordinate amount of thumbsucking among the OE children observed throughout the school.

P.S. --- is staffed predominantly by women. No man was seen on the premises. The faculty was reported to be a stable one; many teachers had been in the school for many years. The principal has been at the school since 1965 (four years) as acting principal. In her own statement of her candid opinion of the worth of OE under the Centralized Plan, she said she felt that the present program had done "a world of good for a few children," but for too few. She thought that more intensive help for the children in their own neighborhood schools would be better for more children. Under "decentralization" she thought more controls on transfers could be effected to achieve transfers of children whose chances for success and positive adjustment were high.

Both the school counselor and the principal deplored the effect of the actual busing on the children. They were strong in recommendations that children with "health problems" should not be included in the OE program. The lack of supervision on the bus was seen as a real problem and as a hazard to children's safety and general well being.

Visits were made to the following:

A. One second grade class

B. All third and fourth grade classes. (These grades were reported to have most of the OE children in them.)

C. The lunchroom during lunch period

D. The playground during noon recess

E. The library

One of the school aides accompanied the observer to visits to classrooms. Most activities in progress were in the area of language arts: reading, oral discussion, listening (to poetry read by the teacher). One social studies lesson was observed. One class was practicing for their assembly program. Arithmetic problem solving was observed in this same group.

The quality of teaching in the majority of classes visited seemed to the observer to be of higher quality than that observed in many schools. There was a kind of vitality in the teachers and children in discussion situations. Teachers' management of their groups, the types of questions they posed related to things read were provocative. Thinking seemed to be stressed. In each of the third and fourth grade classes where reading was in progress, the classes were divided into two groups. While the teacher worked with one group, the other group worked independently. In most rooms, except one, OE children were seated in a scattered pattern.

In Grade 4-2, one group of children was engaged in a variety of activities: crafts, art, writing reports, etc., while the teacher worked with a reading group. The room was vital with children's involvement in their activities. OE children seemed attentive and interested in the reading group and busy in individual tasks in the second group.

Grade 4-1 was engaged in reading. Three OE children were in the class. The room was rich in materials of all kinds, including evidences of children's work. OE children seemed conforming, but not enthusiastic, although the total atmosphere was by no means dull. Quality of discussion of a story read was above average.

Grade 4-3 was having reports on their study of "the way of life of Eskimos." One child was reading to the class her written report. The one OE child in the group was quietly waiting his turn to read his report. Each child, it appeared, had made a booklet of his report, and had culled materials from the usual sources. Little discussion followed the report, as the teacher seemed pressed for time to give other children time to present their materials. Children were attentive and conforming.

Grade 4-5 was reading. Everyone seemed to have a copy of the Children's issue of "The Readers Digest." The room was quiet with every child reading silently. One OE boy among the four O.E. children in the class was pointed out as being especially poorly adjusted in the school. The observer moved around the room. She noted that this boy was reading a poem in the issue. He read it aloud (softly) to her. He could read very well. The classroom atmosphere seemed relaxed, yet controlled.

One second grade was visited, Class 2-1. In it were two OE children, one of whom had been mentioned by both the counselor and the principal as being outstanding. They seemed to say, "If only we had more like her!" She was a beautiful, outgoing child, intelligent, confident. As a member of a trio of soloists she was practicing with her group the song to be sung. She demonstrated poise, assurance, warmth, and seemed totally uninhibited. Problem solving in arithmetic followed. The teacher gave two step problems orally, the children solved them, and told how they arrived at their answers. The girl mentioned above was alert, responding, and accurate. The one other OE child in the room was quiet. He did not participate very much.

The first third grade visited was lining up to go to lunch. Children were happy and active. They said to the visitor, "We have been looking for you." Relationships among the children, and of the teacher with the children, seemed to be friendly and good. A teaching assistant was with the group.

A penmanship lesson was in progress in a third grade visited. Nothing unusual was happening. The teacher's models on the board were of excellent quality. The four OE children in the room seemed bored and uninterested. Two were doing nothing, one was attracting the attention of the fourth by gestures and whispers. The teacher did not seem aware of them at all.

The last third grade was having a reading lesson. The usual two groups were functioning. The oral discussion of the group with whom the teacher was working was unusually good.

The lunchroom was filled with OE and resident children. Children were free to sit as they wished. While a number of OE children were scattered at many different tables, one or two tables were composed exclusively of OE boys. They appeared to be of fourth, fifth and sixth grade levels. The room was orderly and clean. No food wastage was noted. Children were free to go back for seconds, if they wished. The school aide in charge of the room was cordial and proud of the way the lunchroom operation was achieved. She was justified in this attitude.

Children were engaged in free play on the playground at noon. OE children were clustered, for the most part, together. They were "door monitors" and operated in pairs, holding the heavy doors open. This seemed to be a prized responsibility. In the hall during recess two OE girls ran inside to fight in a noisy manner. No one was present to intervene.

No observations were available for corrective reading. It was reported that parents volunteered in this program, and that their attitude for the most part was good. The principal felt that the general attitude of the parents was good.

The library was well equipped and attractive. There was a pile of books on one of the front tables, relating to Africa. Children were assisting the librarian, others were reading. OE children were reading quietly. This was the only evidence noted of materials related to black or Puerto Rican culture.

1. General Comments

There did not seem to be, in this school, deep commitment to the OE program as it is now in operation. Assessment by the principal and counselor seemed realistic and honest. No great claims were made of change for most OE children. A few children, they felt, had benefited tremendously, but a great many had not. The observer saw no school official or personnel who seemed to know all of the children or who was on the premises as a kind of "leading-guiding spirit." On this particular day, the principal was usually closeted in a closed upper room off from the main central school office. Her personal, private office was off a small alcove at the near end of a hall. It had to be unlocked by her for the interview. Office personnel were careful not to invade her privacy.

It seemed to the observer (from what she saw that day) that teachers were not sure enough of their relationships with OE children to be positive and forthright with them in "strife situations."

It may be that the good quality of classroom teaching (techniques and/or strategies) is reaching the children in terms of achievement; as for the social-emotional adjustment of the children, the observer would raise questions.

B. SCHOOL B

School B is in a relatively new school building, located on an sloping hill-like terrain. It is spacious, light and airy, colorful and beautiful. The halls and stairwells are wide and open; the classroom windows open on pleasing vistas from every direction. Classrooms are rich in equipment and materials and evidences of children's work.

The neighborhood is described by the principal as "lower-middle class." The homes surrounding the school are newly built, multiple-dwelling ones. Units seem to be two to four family units, single units are scattered throughout. The school counselor and principal report an unusually good attitude of residential parents toward OE "They are supportive and cooperative with few exceptions."

The principal of the school has been associated with the OE concept since 1960. She is committed to the program in a realistic way. Her expectations for all children, OE and residential, is "high level performance" in every category. This she combines with a sense of "caring for all people" associated with her school but she is not sentimental.

The OE children observed were "real people." They conducted themselves with assurance, were open, questioning, contributing. When the principal called one OE child by name as he explained to a group of adults and children an exhibit in the "Science Fair," he stopped and said to her, "Mrs. K. how did you know my name?" There seem to be no double standards for children in this school.

Both the principal and counselor have worked in OE settings for five or more years. They reflect understanding and insight. The school was on this day a busy, alive, working unit.

There were no black or Puerto Rican personnel apparent. Nor was there evidence of materials (reading or otherwise) relating to black or Puerto Rican culture or history. The principal reported inclusion in the school library of volumes related to these areas. No concerted effort has been made to secure multi-ethnic reading material. Budget cuts were cited as reasons for this lack.

OE children and resident children impressed the observer as having made good adjustments. The school was theirs, they seem to accept each other.

Observations were made of:

A bus trip
The music classes
Contact with two OE parents
The Science Fair
The cafeteria
All classrooms in the school for brief "look-ins."

The principal accompanied the observer throughout the school.

As the observer approached the school, she saw a bus filled with about fifty third-graders parked by the main entrance. In the bus were many OE children, along with residential children; of the five or six parents, three were OE parents. The children and teachers were going to the Brooklyn Children's Museum. They were excitedly chattering away. The observer got on the bus and talked with children and parents. The situation seemed good--although only one of the two buses which had been ordered arrived--adjustment had been made. Some parents followed the bus in their cars, while others rode with the children. Among those who followed in her own car was one OE parent.

The Science Fair was in progress in the school auditorium. Exhibits were placed all around the periphery of the room. Groups of children with their teachers were visiting each exhibit area where assigned children--grades 1 to 6--explained the exhibits. Children seemed to rotate in the responsibility. OE children shared in the roles of visitors and demonstrator discussants. OE children appeared natural; they were interested, they asked questions, those having charge of exhibits were verbal and were not self conscious. The Science coordinators of the school and district were present. OE children related to them and the principal with equanimity. The "Fair" was of the usual content and quality. The observer was impressed with the management of the activity. In the afternoon children had charge of dismantling the Fair. This was done with order and dispatch but with a kind of freedom, too.

A visit was made to the music room where about 35 children were present. Six were OE children. The Glee Club and Band or Orchestra Concert had already been held--May 28. The group sang some of their concert selections for the observer. They sang with fervor and zest. Two adults, Mrs. E. and Mrs. R., were the teachers in charge. They communicated their own enthusiasm to the group. OE children were an integrated part of the whole.

It was later reported to the observer that on May 28, as was done last year, resident children invited OE children to stay with them in their homes between the end of the school day and the time of the night program. This, all seemed to believe, was a positive experience.

The observer looked in again on another music group. Singing was in progress. OE children seemed a part of the activity in a natural, participating manner.

Children were observed in the cafeteria. OE children were scattered at many tables. Relationships seemed relaxed and good. There were a number of cafeteria employees, as contrasted with a school visited the day before in a similar neighborhood. The menu seemed to be a better one; also, the principal noted deviant behavior, stepped in and corrected it; children responded well, without hostility. This she did with all children. Teachers, too, seemed sure of themselves. They did not "molly-coddle" children, but neither were they punitive. They seemed to care enough to help children learn "good things" in all situations.

After lunch, during which time the observer interviewed the principal in her office in the presence of the counselor and an assistant principal, the observer made "pop calls" on every class room. With the principal, brief visits were made to many classes and the library. The quality of teaching, with a few exceptions, seemed to be good. The visits were too brief to merit further description.

At the end of the day one OE parent who had come to the school to pick up her child's science exhibit, volunteered to take the observer back to Manhattan. Another OE parent, one who had gone on the Museum trip, was outside the building. They seemed intelligent, realistic and satisfied with what was happening to their children. The parent in whose car the observer returned to Manhattan said she had had many confrontations on issues with the principal whom she found to be honest, forthright, firm in her convictions, but dedicated to good education. She said, "I have learned to love her, for she is honest and she cares."

Reports from Remedial Reading Teachers given to the principal, in the observer's presence, indicate general but not phenomenal growth in remedial cases. The need for more help in this area was stressed. All schools, it seems, are to have a full-time corrective reading teacher next year. Mrs. K. felt that OE schools need special consideration over and above others.

1. General Comments

It is the observer's impression that the basic ingredients of a good OE program are in operation here. Distance of travel and busing conditions are great problems. The presence of a young woman who accompanies children on the long (over an hour) trip does not seem to help. The observer, on meeting the young woman, felt that a more "mature mother-type" woman--unafraid and positive person--might be more effective in this role.

Both the principal and counselor see the long bus trip as the chief deterrent to more positive results. It takes children time to settle down, they say.

The counselor, who will be full time next year, seemed to the observer to be of unusual sensitivity and competence.

The lack of black and Puerto Rican personnel and materials seemed the one big gap in the program.

C. SCHOOL C

The school building is an old one of about 1925 vintage. The neighborhood is middle-class with well-cared-for one-family dwellings, set back from the streets with clipped lawns, hedges, shrubs and flowers. The school is well ordered, attractive and immaculately clean. One gets the impression that the "business of learning" is of paramount importance. The principal knows "every child" by name and is alert to behavior on all levels: teachers, assistant principals, cafeteria and maintenance staff members, parents and children. His standards seem to be what one usually calls "the good old fashioned ones." Children everywhere: on the street, in the playground, in the classrooms, call, "Hello, Mr. ---." In an assembly observed, a little five-year-old, in the middle of a big auditorium, saw him, stood up in her seat, waved and said, "Hello, Mr. ---." In passing through the dining room, after lunch, he noted maintenance men sweeping the floor, inquired why, found that the regular cafeteria maintenance man had not reported for work. These men were doing this work voluntarily "over the call of duty." Mr. --- knew the men by name, noted this and thanked them. Parents call to him on the streets. Mr. --- is an "institution." His values are apparent everywhere. On the playground as lines are being assembled for children's entrance into the building for the afternoon session, children would come up to him and say, "Mr. ---, may I go into the building?" giving their reasons. After his permission was given, they would enter the building. An OE boy, who was the director of all monitorial jobs, came to him and said, "Mr. ---, we're beginning to have trouble with X again." He and another OE boy stood and talked with Mr. --- until satisfaction was reached. Mr. --- praised this boy very highly to the observer for his general intelligence and organizational ability. Mr. --- often puts his arms around the children as he talks to them, whether in corrective or other situations. This he does with all children-- OE or residential ones. He gave many evidences of wanting the OE program to succeed. This attitude was reflected by a number of teachers also, and by the one black paraprofessional in the school. She came to the observer to discuss her support of the reading program in action in the school. Her child was in it. She gave it strong approval.

Mr. --- is a principal who seems to have an "open door policy" for all members of his school. He is the benevolent, concerned "father figure" whose values are reflected in codes and modes of social behavior, high standards of well-kept physical environment, concern for sound academic achievement, and respect for personality. Children seem to have a role in the operation of the school. In the morning assembly program a pupil gave a report on the year's achievement of the student organization having responsibility for school problems. The form of the report was exact, proper and memorized, but the content gave evidence of children's real involvement with "living" in the school.

There was little evidence of spontaneity and dynamic creativity in the school, but neither was there evidence of hostility, high frustration or horse play. "Mr. --- was there, and everything was all right." This attitude was relevant to and with all OE and resident children. It seemed to the observer to be the key to what impressed her as an effective approach to Open Enrollment.

Observations were made of the following group activities:

A. An assembly program at 10:00 AM, for upper grade pupils, third through sixth grade.

B. The same assembly program at 1:00 PM, given for children of the K through second grades.

C. Club programs which were scheduled from 11:00 to 11:45 AM. Visits were made to the following groups: Art Club, Remedial Reading Group, Science Club, Chorus.

D. The observer was free to walk through the entire building and see classes in action in the early afternoon.

E. The interview with the principal was held during lunch and the one with the counselor was "sandwiched in" partly in the morning and afternoon. Both interviewees finished forms themselves, in order to free the observer to see the children and teachers in action.

F. The playground was observed at the time children assembled to enter the school for the afternoon session.

The first activity observed was the presentation of the musical "Oliver," given by the fifth grade children of the Music Club. Audience attention to the performance was total and rapt as the observer entered the auditorium. OE children were scattered throughout the room with their classes. Their behavior was like that of all of the children: interested, attentive, pleased. The performing group had about four OE children in it. None had leading roles, but they were poised and competent in their minor roles. One stage hand was an OE child.

The play did not have child-like spontaneity or dialogue; it was beautifully sung with care and assurance. Four curtain calls attest to its success.

Parents were there--not too many, five or six, one of whom was the mother of one of the OE children. She seemed very much at home, knew the teachers. She lingered and talked with other parents and teachers after the auditorium emptied. The observer talked with her and other parents.

After the performance children, at Mr. ---'s request, showed the observer their literary magazine (mimeographed). They clustered around the observer as she read aloud some of their poems. One member, an OE boy who had gone on to junior high, still sent back to P.S. --- some of his writings. The children showed his work to me. The observer met and talked with another OE girl who belonged to the group. She seemed to be a talented, sensitive girl. The children, it was clear, had pride in their work; so did the principal, who held club meetings in his office and gave "assigned topics" for creative writing.

The Art Club was visited next. About 12 or 13 children were seated at tables in groups of two or three, absorbed in painting ships. OE children were working along with others, talking, sharing materials, comparing work, conferring with their instructor. There was not animation, but there was serious concern with their work at hand. It seems that model ships (sailing sloops) had been brought in and background had been built for their assignment. Model drawings were on the board. There was no evidence of stress or imagination but each child had brought to his work some measure of individuality. Relationships of OE and resident children were natural and good. Seating was of a scattered pattern. One over-sized OE boy (about 200 pounds, six feet tall in the fifth or sixth grade) who had been a source of much deviant behavior for two years seems to have found some measure of confidence in the Art Club. His behavior has improved; the observer overheard the art instructor say to Mr. --- that this boy and a friend came every lunch period to play chess with him. Children seemed to be clustered according to friendship, not racial, patterns. They were moving about freely but not excessively or unnecessarily.

The Science Club was then visited. Only one OE child was present this day. The lesson was a rather stereotyped one. The teacher had written on the board details of the process by which chlorophyll developed in plants. Each child (about 23) had a small microscope at his seat and a set of slides on his microscope. One child raised, spontaneously, a question; others sat and listened as the teacher read to the class the chalkboard passage. The one OE child present, a Puerto Rican boy, was in front of his row.

The teacher was anxious to let the observer know that one child present was OE A second member was absent. She sent a note later asking the observer to return and note this.

The Remedial Reading Group was composed of 11 children of third grade level. Five were OE (all black) children. The lesson had to do with the suffix "less" and its meaning and use. The room was richly equipped with reading aids: charts, cards, books, etc. The teacher held a chart on which the suffix was added to words: tree-less, hour-less, etc.

The teacher called on children to read specific words and tell their meaning. She did not know the children's names (OE or resident) and did not seem alert to or be accepting of children's responses to her questions unless these responses were exactly what she was looking for (predictable). One little OE boy raised his hand often, made wordy and often inexact responses. He was very verbal and really quite smart, but the teacher ignored his showing-off, smart-alecky responses although he volunteered over and over again. In his discussion of meaning there were evidences of real thinking. His intelligence was very apparent. The children in this group were attentive but seemingly not deeply motivated at the moment; right after an exciting play, who could care about suffixes?

The Chorus was directed by a young black musician, the regular full-time music faculty member. This man is a member of the Metropolitan Opera Chorus. He is a seemingly very competent and gifted man. The chorus had about 50 or more children in it, a number of whom were OE children. The quality of singing achieved was lovely, the repetoire wide. There seemed to be enjoyment and certainly full participation. The music teacher is a warm, attractive man. Adults and children respond to him well. He was observed after the assembly surrounded by children and parents.

This teacher and the reading aide were the only non-white personnel in the school.

1. General Comments

a. Classroom Settings

Rich in equipment and materials, much evidence of children's work on display. Reading materials of multi-ethnic content were evident throughout the school in every classroom observed. The relationships of teachers with children were respecting and respectful, firm but kind.

b. Teachers and Teaching

A number of men are on the faculty. A good number are young. Only one black teacher was seen, no Puerto Rican faculty members were observed or met.

The way of working with children was controlled, concern was with academic achievement, methods rather traditional.

Integrity of professional behavior was apparent in faculty throughout the school. There was a general attitude of pride in the school and in OE children.

c. Interpersonal Relationships Among Children

Relationships among children were natural. There were observed no unusual groupings of children along racial lines within or without the classrooms. Children in the halls, in classrooms, on the playgrounds, in the lunchroom were clustered in varied patterns. There were fewer than the usual amount of incidents of friction observed. One fight between two OE boys (sixth grade) took place on the playground. Two young men teachers moved in and stopped it.

d. Academic Improvement

Both the principal and the guidance counselor report evidence of general academic improvement of OE children with, of course, some exceptions. The principal was especially optimistic about the improvement in reading. Every child who is one year or more behind in reading achievement, it was reported, receives some form of individual help. Sources of help are several: a full-time corrective reading teacher, volunteer help of about 40 resident parents, volunteer help of Arista children, volunteer help of one retired teacher.

e. Parent-Community Relations

Some parent meetings have been held in --- Church in the community of the sending schools. The principal reports mixed reaction of resident parents to the presence of OE children, but not aggressive anti-OE movement among parents. The Guidance Counselor reports over 50 visits to the school of OE parents.

d. Conclusion

The positive evidences observed of the Open Enrollment Program in action at P.S. --- far outweigh, in this observer's estimation, the negative ones. The observer gives this program a good evaluation.

D. SCHOOL D

1. Program Review

Program for OE children includes intensive tutoring and reading remediation.

There are three tutoring programs:

1. High school student tutoring program: About ten to 12 high school students volunteer to tutor any pupil in math. They come every day for one hour (2:00 to 3:00 PM).
2. Older student tutoring program: Four sixth grade students who have been behavior problems tutor four younger children (one to one) for 45 minutes per day.
3. Parent tutoring program: Through the Parent Association volunteers are solicited. They come one to two times per week and work on one to one basis with children. At present 25 parents participate. The corrective reading teacher coordinates this effort. OE and resident children are involved.

a. Small Group Instruction

The corrective reading teacher does some small group instruction. There are three paraprofessionals who work with her and with children both in small groups and on individual basis. These helpers are trained by the district reading coordinator and work only with children, as the aides are hired with Title I funds.

Additionally, there are six student teachers in the school: two from New York University who come every day and tutor children (any child); four from Brooklyn College come two days per week and tutor children. The Brooklyn College students receive college credit.

The guidance counselor is planning a survey to determine how well the school is meeting needs of out-of-district children.

E. SCHOOL E

1. Program Review

a. Bus Aide Program

Three aides ride buses to and from school with OE children. They have the responsibility for helping to contain children in the auditorium while waiting for the bus to go home, and on the bus they engage in a variety of activities designed to be both educational and recreational. For example, they play word games, math games, listening activities, etc. There are 16 aides in the school and all have responsibility for checking children on and off buses. Special training for bus aides was offered through the District Office.

b. Language Arts Materials Production

School aides are trained to prepare audiovisual materials for teachers. Some of the materials are multi-ethnic. The aide knows also how to use audiovisual machines and assists teachers with this task. I saw some transparencies and color slides that an aide had made.

c. Reading-Counseling Program

This program was new this year and was in operation six weeks. The purposes were to diagnose reading problems and re-motivate children to learn to read. Parents must participate in a parent education program if their child is to be included in the program. The parent education program has three dimensions:

a. parents learn about reading skills, games, etc.

b. one aspect of guidance is explored in depth: i.e., discipline, responsibility, etc.

c. phonics approach is stressed; special skill stressed each week.

Two reading teachers are involved in this program. One works with the children, the other with parents and guidance counselor.

Children who are retarded two or more years in reading are considered for the program. They try to screen youngsters and take those who have normal intelligence potential, no mentally retarded children or children with severe emotional problems. In the fall of 1969 the program will commence with upper grade pupils and work into the lower grades. Each group meets for six weeks, two hours per day. Regular classroom teachers are expected to follow through.

d. Guidance

This school has a full-time counselor who works primarily, but not exclusively, with OE children. She is a Negro, who appears to have good rapport with staff and students and seems very capable.

2. Observer's Impressions

Everyone in this school was very friendly and appeared genuinely interested in all the children. The administrators were dynamic, energetic, enthusiastic people with a real feeling for children, no matter what their color or status in life. It was my impression that a wholesome learning environment prevailed, and that the OE children were truly welcome in this school.

F. SCHOOL F

1. Program Review

An intensive reading program has been instituted for OE children. The corrective reading teacher has three educational assistants working with her. All are involved in the reading program. Two of the assistants work with children on a one-to-one basis. The other assists the corrective reading teacher in the classrooms. The reading teacher has five groups per day, with seven to ten children per group. Intensive remediation is done with these children because they are the ones who have the most severe reading disabilities. Groups include resident and OE children.

The school is very well equipped with a wide variety of materials, many of them purchased with Title I funds. Materials include S.R.A. Language Lab, Sullivan Programmed Reading Material, new series of diagnostic workbooks, and practice reading tests on which practice in advance of standardized tests can be given.

The parent tutoring program ended in May. Five parents were involved.

The thrust of the program is improving reading and this is where primary emphasis is placed.

2. Guidance

There are two counselors who spend two days each in the school. One counselor has responsibility for OE children. My impression was that she was overly concerned with punctuality and attendance. She remarked (and this was one of her recommendations) that "problem children" shouldn't be included in OE She was convinced that white schools have a real contribution to make to Negro children, and they (the Negro children) were lucky to have the opportunity for this kind of education.

My visit with the principal was very brief. She is new and came to the school in February. She appeared to be dynamic and "on top of things."

The general atmosphere was good. As I observed the classrooms and spoke to a few of the teachers it was my impression that the children were "at home" and posed no unique problems.

G. SCHOOL G

School G has roughly 1300 pupils in grades K-6, of which 670 arrive by bus. About 400 of the bus riders are mandated transfers; they come from nearby schools that are overcrowded. There are about 100 free choice transfers and 45 children who are bussed from the --- Orphanage. The remaining number are emotionally disturbed or mentally retarded children.

With these transfers, the ethnic and racial make-up of the school is roughly 50 percent white, 25 percent Negro, and 25 percent Puerto Rican. About 40 Negro children live in the neighborhood, mainly in a middle-income housing project, and there are a few Puerto Rican children from the neighborhood. Thus, the bus-neighborhood distinction does not follow exactly along racial and ethnic lines.

The principal reports that community acceptance of Open Enrollment has been favorable. At first (eight years ago) there was some opposition, but the principal was able to persuade the community that Open Enrollment would be to its benefit, for only then could they obtain the extra services they needed. More recently, neighborhood parents have asked that the proportion of children arriving by bus not exceed 50 percent of the school population. The principal felt that this was a reasonable request.

Open Enrollment, according to the principal, has been socially useful to both the neighborhood children and the bused children: they have learned to respect each other. There are many instances of social integration: neighborhood children inviting bused children to their homes for lunch or to birthday parties. (Invitations in the reverse direction, however, were not noted.) She mentioned one indication, however, of the social distance between whites and Negroes: they never fight with each other, although there are many occasions on which whites fight with whites and Negroes fight with Negroes. She feels there is a strong inhibition against inter-racial fighting, which is implanted by the parents. Despite the principal's generalization, I observed a white and Negro boy in a brief fight in the playground. They were playing softball, both on the same side. Apparently they were chasing after the same ball and collided. The Negro fell to the ground and hurt his hand. At first they were yelling at each other, each accusing the other of interference. The Negro boy threw several punches at the white boy and there was more yelling back and forth. It was over very quickly and the boys went back to playing together. There was no supervision so there was no adult interference, and the other players (both Negro and white) hardly took notice. It was a minor matter and I mentioned it only because it contradicts the principal's perception about fighting between the two.

Besides social advantages, the principal believes that the bused children receive educational benefits. First, there is a simple matter of overcrowding: School G is less crowded than the schools from which these children come. Nonetheless, at School G some grades are above average (about 27 in the Bronx) in class size. The following table shows the class size and the average for each grade:

Grade	Size of Classes	Grade Average
6	33, 34, 33, 27, 21	29.6
5	34, 32, 32, 30	32.0
4	32, 30, 31, 24, 26	28.6
3	30, 29, 28, 30, 23, 20	26.6
2	32, 31, 30, 29, 28, 24, 22	28.00
1	25, 28, 27, 26, 25, 28, 27, 26, 22	26.00
Kg.	--	23

I was shown several programs that exist at P.S. ---, but they do not all necessarily affect the children who are bussed in. The Junior Guidance program is the main example. This program is for 25 severely disturbed children, all schizophrenic and some autistic. Three teachers and five or six aides work with these children. The aides are all parents of children in the school; at one time they volunteered, but now are being paid $1.75 per hour. One of the parents has an autistic child in the program, but she works only with the other children. These children do arrive by bus, but they are placed in this program because of a referral from a private doctor, --- Hospital, or a teacher from another school. The program is not intended to service free-choice or mandated transfers; it would exist with or without an Open Enrollment program. The same is true of the 65 mentally retarded children who are bused in. These children are not drawn from among the free-choice or mandated transfers.

The corrective reading program, however, does involve children who are bused in. According to the records in the principal's office, there are six children receiving corrective reading and three are transfers, and three are from the neighborhood. According to the corrective reading teachers, she thought five were transfers and one was from the neighborhood, but she really wasn't sure and didn't care. These six children receive corrective reading for two hours, once a week.

The instruction for the children is complemented by instruction and guidance for their parents. The parents of all six came to the school for two hours, every week for six weeks. They received instruction in how to help their children, and were given materials that would be useful. Besides instructions, the guidance teacher discussed the child's problems and gave other advice on how to enrich their experience.

Shortly after the program began, the parents reported marked interest among the children in their school work and particularly in their reading. The guidance teacher said this change was due to a show of interest by the parents. The parents were delighted with the program and would like to come back next year.

The corrective reading teacher also noted a marked improvement once the parents began coming to the school. She believes the corrective reading program should be expanded, with accompanying parental involvement, but this would require an additional corrective reading teacher on the staff.

From all reports, then, the corrective reading program is successful, and the involvement of parents is an important part of the program. But, it should be emphasized that this program only touched six children and according to the corrective reading teacher there are many more children in the school who could use it.

In addition, there are 100 children in the remedial reading program. They receive remedial instruction two hours a week. Open Enrollment children are over-represented in this program (that is, more than 50 percent); nonetheless, there are many neighborhood children in the program.

The principal said she could use more corrective reading teachers, one for each grade, and more remedial reading teachers.

She said her most serious reading problem was non-English speaking children. To help Puerto Rican children (born in Puerto Rico or from homes where only Spanish is spoken) there is a special class with a bi-lingual teacher. The principal noted that this was essential. Unfortunately, it has only children in the first and second grades, and she would like to have another bi-lingual teacher for the upper grades.

School G has an extensive audiovisual program. This is the chief source of multi-ethnic materials:

Film strips: Leading American Negroes, A Child's Life in the Big City

Color slides: The Search for a Black Past

Tape recordings: The Negro in America, One Out of Many, Young Heroes, Americans to Remember, Senorita Jones (and five others)

Phonograph records: George Washington Carver, The Glory of Negro History, Adventures in Negro History

The multi-ethnic materials are catalogued and copies are distributed to teachers so they can select what they want. Fifth and sixth grade children make up the audiovisual squad (about 60 children). They distributed the materials and the equipment to teachers on request. The children are very enthusiastic about this work, in the course of which they learn to splice film and tape and run the film projectors. From my observation of the audiovisual squad, they were indeed enthusiastic and proud of what they could do. Bused children work on this squad on an equal basis with neighborhood children.

Busing at P.S. ---, since it involves half the school, is a major operation, requiring the use of sixteen buses. I was able to observe the departure at the end of the school day. The logistics of getting all the children sorted out and on the right bus were considerable. At times I felt I was witnessing the evacuation at Dunkirk. The whole operation begins in the classroom at 2:35 and takes about 40 minutes to complete. It requires the sole concentration of eight to ten teachers, the principal, two assistant principals and three school aides who ride the buses. During the course of sorting and lining up, both the auditorium and the cafeteria are used.

School is over, the children are restless and eager to get home and there seems to be a lot of difficulty in maintaining order. There are continuous calls for silence, to sit down, and so on, accompanied by threats of punishment for misbehavior. The priority in getting on buses is, to some extent, used as a reward. The best behaved children are able to leave first. For the most part, boys and girls are segregated as they file on the buses, but there are some exceptions when a brother and sister are supposed to sit together. There is considerable confusion (and anxiety among the children) until these pairs are gotten together. The ride for the mandated transfers is not too long--about 15 or 20 minutes; for the free-choice transfers it may run to 45 minutes. Besides getting all the children aboard and on the right bus the ride itself creates problems. There are only three aides to supervise the children, so that many trips go unattended. (The 25 emotionally disturbed children who ride the same bus go home unattended.)

Without supervision, there is a lot of horseplay, some fighting, and danger (from open windows) on the buses. On my one day at school these were the incidents that I was able to observe (others may have occurred of which I am unaware):

1. A boy was arriving by bus for afternoon kindergarten. (Kg. is on a split session.) Apparently he was out of his seat, fooling around with some of the other children. The bus stopped short and he fell, injuring his foot going down on the step at the exit door. He was brought to the principal's office, where he sat with his shoe off, for about twenty minutes. Later he went to the nurse's office to await the arrival of his mother to take him home. She

was called by telephone at her work in another borough. She left work and was now on her way to the school to pick up her child and bring him home. The injury may not have been serious (although the child was crying during all the time I saw him) but the trouble for the mother was considerable--all of which may have been avoided if there had been supervision on the bus.

2. One older boy (fifth or sixth grade) was put under the special care of one of the aides. On the previous day he had evaded all the teachers and principals and walked home. He doesn't like to ride the bus. Now he was being threatened with punishment.

3. Two girls in the fifth or sixth grade refused to get on the bus because there were some boys on the bus who picked on them. The teacher insisted that they get on, but they absolutely refused. They were brought to the principal. Again they refused; their minds were made up. The principal told them if they did not get on that bus they would have to walk home. To the principal's surprise they found that more acceptable and said, "Okay, we'll walk home." The principal, then, changed her mind and told them to get on another bus--one going into their neighborhood but with much younger children.

As these examples and the comments of the principal indicate, the busing operation is far from satisfactory--neither for the children nor for the teachers. Yet it requires considerable time and effort from everybody. One thing that is clearly needed is more aides; in fact, nearly every bus should have supervision by an adult. In addition, there have been suggestions that audiovisual material or other distractions be provided to keep the children occupied at a time when they are so restless.

H. SCHOOL H

Open Enrollment at School H can only be understood by considering first the kind of school it is. It is unusual--a very good school. One indication of the quality of instruction is the reading scores:

Grade	Mean Reading Scores
6	6.9
5	7.04
4	5.36
3	4.91
2	3.51

All the classes show reading scores above grade level, and, among the few class records that I examined, very few pupils were below grade level.

These reading scores would not be surprising if these children came from families with college educated, well-to-do, professional parents. But this is not true at P.S. ---. The neighborhood is made up of middle and lower middle-class families: white collar and skilled workers, policemen, firemen, and other civil service workers. Most families are Catholic (some Methodists and other Protestant groups), mainly second and third generation Irish and Italian with some German.

The neighborhood is unusual in several ways. It has not been subject to the swift population growth and changes that have occurred in many other neighborhoods in the city. There has been no dramatic expansion in building, no urban renewal, no abandonment of old buildings. There are, of course, a few new one and two-family homes, and one new elevator apartment house, but otherwise the number of dwelling units is pretty much the same as it was thirty or forty years ago. Most of the houses and multiple dwellings are old, having been built around the turn of the century, but they are kept in excellent repair. Yards and lawns are cared for in a way that suggests these families have a strong commitment to their neighborhood and property.

There has also been a relatively small change in the ethnic distribution. The change that has occurred has been mainly a slow withdrawal of Protestant families, an increasing number of Italian Catholics, and a few Jewish families who have moved into the new apartment house. But essentially the neighborhood is stable. (Only two or three Negro families live in the neighborhood.)

This neighborhood also differs from others in its age distribution. It has a greater proportion of older people than one usually finds. This stability in demographic characteristics should be seen in contrast to what has happened in other communities: when high rise apartments were built on land formerly occupied by one- and two-family houses, older people were replaced by younger families who are raising children, causing a dramatic rise in the school age population, and schools become overcrowded until new ones are built. But none of this has occurred at P.S. ---.

Another factor affecting the school population is the Catholic school. It is the major institution in the neighborhood and the majority of the children go there. Grades one to eight in the Catholic school have an enrollment of 1200 pupils. At P.S. ---, in grades one to 6, there are 200 neighborhood children and 54 open enrollment children.

The stability of the population, with most children attending the Catholic school, means that P.S. --- is a small school, and class size is small. Including Open Enrollment children, the class size at P.S. --- is as follows:

Grade	Number of Classes	Class Size
6	1	33
5	2	22
4	2	23
3	2	23
2	2	20
1	2	21

In addition, at P.S. --- there are 130 kindergarten children (no Open Enrollment) and 18 mentally retarded children in special classes. Most of the kindergarten children (roughly two-thirds) will not enter the first grade at P.S. ---, but transfer to the Catholic school.

School and class size are merely the favorable circumstances that bear upon the success at P.S. ---. It is the principal, the teaching staff, the educational philosophy, and teaching methods that really make the school successful. The principal has led a group of energetic teachers into adopting some innovative teaching practices. With the exception of the sixth grade, within heterogeneous classes pupils are divided into three relatively homogeneous groups. The teacher moves from group to group, giving instruction and setting out work on which they proceed on their own. In each classroom, there are several work centers. Once a child learns the system he is able to work on his own. Under these circumstances, the pupils work at their own level, with many pupils receiving individualized instruction.

Needless to say, the classroom atmosphere, the teaching methods, the relatively small classes, are all advantages that the Open Enrollment children share with the children from the neighborhood. If a child has any deficiencies, he works in a group at his level, thereby avoiding the possible frustration he would experience if he had to keep up with the class as a whole. Similarly, the bright child is not held back; he is given work at a level that will challenge him.

Grouping, of course, can be harmful if, once a child is assigned to a certain level, he is simply forgotten. But, at P.S. --- as the child progresses in his work, he is moved to a higher group. Similarly, if a teacher incorrectly assigns a pupil it is quickly discovered. All of this is possible because the classes are small and the teacher is very familiar with what each pupil can do.

Finally, grouping has not had the effect of segregating OE children from neighborhood children. Based on my tour of classes at P.S. ---, OE children are spread throughout all levels within the classes.

P.S. --- has a remedial reading teacher five days a week. Roughly 60 children receive remedial instruction and OE children are slightly over represented. The remedial teacher does not keep records according to the OE -neighborhood distinction, so she could only estimate what the number might be. Of the 60 pupils, she thought 20 or 30 were OE children.

In addition, children who are weak in other subjects or who have social adjustment problems receive individual instruction and attention from community volunteers (15). OE children share in this benefit with the neighborhood children.

To sum up at this point, if an OE child comes to P.S. --- with any deficiencies (or with special abilities) he has the advantage of grouping within the classroom, remedial reading instruction, and individual attention from volunteers. And at P.S. --- all of this occurs without stigmatizing OE children, since the slower groups, the remedial classes, and individual instruction are made up of both OE and neighborhood children.

Because the OE children are at all levels within the classrooms, it has important consequences, in terms of reference groups, for an OE child who may be in the lower group at a certain time. He is able to see other OE children, who are black, whom he rides the bus with, whom he is most likely to identify with, receiving the rewards and recognition of being in higher groups. How much of motivating force this can be is difficult to say; however, if the situation were different, if all the OE children were in the lower groups, if the remedial and individual instruction were all concentrated on OE children, it could have a demoralizing effect. Despite the favorable circumstances and excellent instruction at P.S. ---, there are some drawbacks for OE children. Most of these disadvantages were noted by the teachers. They are not new and have been discussed before in connection with Open Enrollment programs. In reviewing these points, it should be kept in mind that they are minor considerations in the light of the better educational opportunities at P.S. --- compared to what the OE child is likely to have in his neighborhood school. This does not mean that these disadvantages should be overlooked; some solutions should be found.

OE children have a longer school day than neighborhood children. Some teachers feel that when they arrive at school they are already a bit worn out. Typically, they begin their day at 7:30 AM on a street corner waiting for their bus. In cold weather, or on snowy or rainy days, it is an additional hardship. At lunch time all OE children eat in the lunchroom (with some neighborhood children) but most neighborhood children go home for lunch. This fact is mentioned as a drawback only in the sense that it tends to set OE children apart from the others. The school policy, however, is flexible: if an OE child brings a note from his parents he is permitted to eat lunch outside the school--either in a luncheonette or at a friend's house in the neighborhood. At the end of the school day, the OE children depart on buses and lose the opportunity to be with and play with their classmates. After hours, the school is open as a community center and many of the neighborhood children use it. But the OE children are on the way back to their own neighborhoods. The community center is, however, the only activity that OE children miss. The music group, the journalism club, etc., all meet during regular school hours and the OE children participate equally.

One of the most serious disadvantages for OE children is what happens when they get sick. For neighborhood children, the parents are called and the parent can come to pick up the child. Or the child can be sent home with an older brother or sister. In any case, transportation for a neighborhood child who is sick is not a problem. For an OE child, it is frequently impossible for the parent to come for the child and there are no means at present for sending the child home. The child spends the day on a cot waiting for the end of the school day and the bus that takes him home.

Of all the disadvantages of OE , the problem of the sick child seems to be the one that could be overcome most easily. It would, of course, cost money, but a special car service should be available for children who become sick. Such a service should be available on call, to all schools in the district.

The problem of the OE child who becomes sick, however, should not be overemphasized. It occurs infrequently and often is no great hardship. Nonetheless, some better arrangement should be sought; it should not be dismissed as the price that these children and their parents must pay to obtain the same education as others.

The distance between the school and home has other consequences. The principal and the teachers are eager to have parents become involved in their children's education, to visit the school, and to speak with the teachers. Obviously, this is more difficult for parents who do not live in the neighborhood. This is not to say that none of the OE parents visit the school, but only that they are less likely to. There are, however, special workshops for OE parents which meet once every two months. These meetings are designed to help parents help their children and to discuss any problems that may come up in connection with the Open Enrollment program. The site for these workshops rotates: one year it is held in the neighborhood where the parents live, the following year at P.S. ---.

The principal noted some OE parents were suspicious when their children first started attending P.S. ---. Sometimes they felt that their children were not being treated equally, but after the first year the fears disappeared and the parents send their second and third child.

Open Enrollment has been in operation for six years, ever since Mrs. --- has been principal. At first there was some neighborhood resistance, with the usual fears and threats of withdrawing children, but the resistance has been overcome and the withdrawal of children did not materialize. Nor has there been any marked exodus of families from the neighborhood.

Several factors seem to account for the relative calm: the strong leadership of the principal and her ability to persuade the community, the effective use of a community advisory board to discuss the issues and provide leadership in the community, and the support for Open Enrollment by the Catholic Church and more recently by the Methodist Church.

The cooperation between the Catholic Church and the public school appears to be somewhat unusual. The principal has excellent relations with the Monsignor, each helping the other on several matters. For example, as mentioned earlier, most of the children who are in Kindergarten will enroll in the first grade at the Catholic school. If the principal feels that one of the children is not ready for Catholic school, she simply informs the Monsignor who then tells the parents to keep the child in public school. The reasons for this suggestion might be that the child needs special attention which he will be able to get only in the public school because class size is half what it is in the Catholic school. Another reason might be that the child has had problems in social adjustment with other children, particularly with Negroes or other dark skinned children.

Recently, some parents have raised fears about sex education in the public schools, specifically because Negroes and whites were receiving this instruction together. In this instance, the Monsignor and other community leaders are called upon to exert the influence, thereby preventing sex education from becoming an issue for community conflict.

In conclusion, Open Enrollment at P.S. --- appears to be a success. The children who are bused in receive a better education than they probably would in their own neighborhood. There are some disadvantages for them and there should be some effort to lessen their impact, but these disadvantages do not outweigh the advantage of getting a better education.

The neighborhood children likewise benefit from their exposure to Negro children. Without Open Enrollment, their experience would be Negro-free, an unrealistic situation for children in urban America. This fact was emphasized by the one Negro teacher at P.S. ---, who has observed the healthy relations that develop between Negro and white children.

Considering its success it seems unfortunate that a new ruling will not permit any new OE children to attend P.S. --- unless they already have a brother or sister attending. Whatever the reasons may be for this decision in other schools, it seems unwarranted at P.S. ---. It is a small school, with small classes; it has room for more OE children who could benefit from the education it offers.

Open Enrollment is, of course, an artificial situation leading to the disadvantages mentioned earlier. These, however, can only be overcome by housing desegregation, which is only the logical step to take. And it is not entirely unrealistic to suggest it. Some OE parents might be willing to move to this neighborhood, and with the support of the public school and the Catholic church, it might be possible.

I. AN EVENING GUIDANCE CENTER

The center services students and parents from one High School, one Junior High School and three elementary schools.

The Guidance Center has been operating since January 1969. At first it was open only two evenings a week, Tuesdays and Thursdays, from 7-10 PM. But the demand for services was too much, so the Center added Wednesday to its schedule at the request of the Supervisor of the District. The hours were also changed to 5-8 PM. The Coordinator explained that parents were afraid to be out after nine o'clock in certain parts of the neighborhood, particularly the low-income housing project.

The center is staffed by three professionals: a psychiatric social worker, a psychologist and a guidance counselor. In addition, there are two paraprofessionals and a neighborhood volunteer who tutor a few children in reading and math. The professionals are available for consultation with students (including dropouts) and parents. Usually, the first step is to do testing, diagnosis and evaluation, depending on the needs of the client. After each of the professionals have met the client, the three meet together to decide what they should recommend. They themselves can offer no follow-up or clinical services, such as weekly counseling or therapy, so their main effort with social or psychological problems is to refer the client to a clinic, possibly Jacobi Hospital, or wherever they can find a service. The Coordinator acknowledged, however, that there is little they can do for clients who need regular counseling. Services are just not available.

Although the staff is limited in providing continuing services, it has given counseling to roughly 80 parents. They have come in, or were asked to by their children's teacher, and received counseling (one or two visits) on what they might do to help their child. This service has been worthwhile, but once again, limited. The parents need more follow-up than they receive.

At present eight children are being tutored at that Guidance Center. Six are boys (four Negro and two Puerto Rican) who came to the Coordinator and asked for help in reading. They are reading at a fourth grade level and are scheduled to graduate from public school and go into Junior High school next year. They believe that they cannot go to Junior High (which they want to do very much) unless they are reading at a fifth grade level. This restriction, however, does not apply to children who have already been held back, which is true of all six boys. Thus, the boys will go on to Junior High regardless of their reading level, but the boys are unaware of this loophole. In any case, the six boys are faithfully coming to tutoring, 45 minutes each night. At first they attempted to tutor the boys, who are good friends, as a group, but there was too much disruption. Now they are being tutored in pairs and it seems to be working very well. The tutoring is done by two paraprofessionals who were trained by the Coordinator.

In addition, one neighborhood volunteer is helping two girls in reading and math. The coordinator emphasized that the big problem with pupil achievement is reading and math and that the problem does not stem from a lack of intelligence. There are many others who need tutoring or special services, but they have none to offer at the Guidance Center.

The staff was, however, able to get some high school boys to volunteer to do some tutoring in reading. The boys are in the honor class at the High School which is diagonally across the street from one of the Elementary schools. The staff members spoke to the Brothers at the High School, and they encouraged the boys to volunteer. According to the coordinator, the program is working well, but they need much more of this kind of thing.

Much of the success and activity at the Guidance Center is due to the Coordinator personally. He has been at the school for over six years, is well known, and both the parents and students find him easy to approach and talk to. (He is Negro and over 60 percent of the pupils are Negro.) Frequently he will be approached by parents or students as he walks to and from school. Recently several boys who are drop-outs met him in the street and asked him if he could get them into a vocational school or job training school. Since they left school they have been working, but the jobs have been trivial and paid poorly. With this bitter experience, they now want to return, but so far the Coordinator hasn't been able to find anything for them. He is still working on it.

According to the Coordinator, the schools in the district that have no clinical services send their problem children to the center for testing, diagnosis and evaluation.

All of the services at the Guidance Center have nothing to do with the problems of Open Enrollment at this school or the other schools for that matter. In fact, there are no free choice nor mandated transfers coming into P.S. ---. Some children arrive by bus, but they come from nearby Co-op City, which does not have its own school yet. To accommodate these new children many of the children who live in the neighborhood are bused out to two different schools. But Open Enrollment as it is commonly understood does not exist at P.S. ---.

The problems that the Guidance Center handles are the typical ones stemming from the social and economic deprivation of the children. Most of the children come from either a new middle income housing project or an older (and much larger) low income project. The Coordinator said that the children from the low income project face the same problems as the slum children. Many are recently from the slums and they bring their problems with them. He emphasized this point because most people find it hard to believe in a school that is located at the far end of the --- in the wide-open spaces. He said, for example, an active drug (heroin) trade exists in the low income project which is having a debilitating and demoralizing effect on the neighborhood.

The low income project has experienced a swift change in its ethnic and racial make-up. About eight years ago, according to the Coordinator, the majority of tenants were white; now 20 percent are white, with 40 percent black and 40 percent Puerto Rican.

Speaking of Open Enrollment (but now referring to another school in the district) the Coordinator noted a change in attitude over the years by teachers and supervisors. At first, he said, they were suspicious, hostile, fearful and resisted it. But now most of them are favorable; they have seen the good job that Open Enrollment can do (although in a limited way).

As far as P.S. --- goes, it is difficult to give an overall description of the school because it is in a state of flux. Two-thirds of the children who live in the neighborhood and should be attending are bused out to other schools in order to make room for children from the two new co-ops. This situation is likely to continue until schools are eventually built to handle the Co-op children.

J. TWO PROJECTS IN ONE DISTRICT

1. Project I--A School Bus Aide Program and a Language Arts Materials Production Program

Both of the above programs were coordinated by the District Supervisor of Audio-Visual Instruction. The School Bus Aide Program was conceived of as a means of bringing OE parents into the receiving community to establish closer ties between the two. It was proposed that the aides be chosen by the 13 schools involved. The suggested qualifications for the aides were that they be mature, reliable, bilingual, and from the sending school district. A second goal of the program was to provide the bilingual children riding the bus with learning experiences which would help to facilitate their integration into the regular school program.

a. The School Bus Aide Program

Eight orientation sessions were held for the school bus aides. During these sessions the aides were acquainted with activities which could be used during the bus ride and interim waiting periods. In addition, they were introduced to activities which could be used with small groups and for individual instruction.

A booklet titled "Guidelines for Aides" was distributed which suggested the following activities:

1. During the bus ride--simple songs, finger plays, and observational experiences based on the community.
2. During interim waiting periods--the above activities to be supplemented with filmstrips, recordings and tapes.
3. Small group and individual instruction--for selected students who will benefit from activities stressing communication skills.

The experiences related to conversation about the child, his home, school and community. Curriculum activities related to picture reading, reading readiness and number, size and shape relationships. Aides were provided with a tape recording of the finger plays and songs.

b. The Language Arts Materials Production Program

This program was designed to train school aides to prepare audio-visual materials such as tapes, slides and large transparencies. These materials were to be used with small groups of OE children having learning frustrations because of language difficulties. This program was planned to operate in nine schools each having the services of a school aide for two hours daily. Twelve orientation sessions were held and many individual school visits were made by the A-V supervisor.

Both of the programs were considered a success by the supervisor. She indicated that some schools had experienced difficulty in finding aides to ride the buses. This was corroborated by two principals who stated:

> "Difficult to find a person to travel on the school bus from an area several miles from the school, since transportation home is difficult and lengthy."
>
> "Have four bus aides but they don't ride buses. Tried to get people to ride the bus. Use the aides in school to work with groups of children."

The aides used for the Language Arts Materials Production Program were all from the receiving school district.

Both of these programs could beneficially be tried by other districts. However, the problem of securing sufficient numbers of school aides remains. The possibility of using older children as paid bus supervisors might be explored.

2. Project II--Reading Resource Room

The reading resource room was designed to be a workshop conference center and central point for acquainting school personnel in the District with newer and more effective materials in the area of reading. Part of the time it is planned for the room to be a Production Center for instructing teachers in the use of audiovisual equipment and for the preparation of materials. Six school aides were hired and are being taught how to use the learning programs and to operate the machinery involved in the programs. They in turn will help visiting professional personnel to learn about the programs and how to use the machinery.

The resource room is located in a new intermediate school. It has already been stocked with a wide variety of materials. One difficulty encountered by the District Reading Consultant in charge of the Resource Room involves the interpretation of Title I Guidelines. Programmed material had been ordered which required machinery for its operation. The Board of Education interpreted Title I Guidelines as barring the purchase of hardware. The non-mechanical portion of the program had been delivered. However, correspondence with the person in charge at the Board had not produced any results at the time of the interview. In fact, the consultant had recently received a letter which indicated that the money for the machinery was no longer available.

This project has great potential. However, it would appear that without more liberal interpretation of the guidelines the real potential will never be realized.

APPENDIX D

STAFF LIST

David J. Fox, Evaluation Chairman
Professor
Director of Research and Graduate Studies
School of Education
The City College
The City University of New York

Colleen Stewart, Project Director
Research Associate, Office of Research and Evaluation Services
Lecturer
School of Education
The City College
The City University of New York

Lois Steinberg, Consultant
Research Associate, Office of Research and Evaluation Services
School of Education
The City College
The City University of New York

Ruth Adams, Observer
Associate Professor
School of Education
The City College
The City University of New York

Nasrene Adibe, Observer
Lecturer
Department of Elementary Education
Queens College
The City University of New York

Harry Donahoe, Observer
Assistant Director
The Reading Institute
New York University

Richard G. Durnin, Observer
Associate Professor
School of Education
The City College
The City University of New York

Roberta Gutman, Observer
Remedial Reading Specialist

Ruth Korey, Observer
Associate Professor
School of Education
Fordham University

Phyllis L. Kornfeld, Observer
Lecturer, Graduate Division
Brooklyn College
The City University of New York

Kenneth Lenihan, Observer
Doctoral Candidate
Columbia University

Louise Matteoni, Observer
Associate Professor
School of Education
Brooklyn College
The City University of New York

Dorothy L. McCormack, Observer
Lecturer
School of Education
Richmond College
The City University of New York

Elaine V. Morton, Observer
Supervisor of Secondary Grades
The Reading Institute
New York University

Vera Pitts, Observer
Assistant Professor
School of Education
The City College
The City University of New York

Benjamin Popper, Observer
Director
The Reading Institute
New York University

Theresa A. Woodruff, Observer
Associate Professor
School of Education
The City College
The City University of New York

Judith Field, Research Assistant
Lecturer
Lehman College
The City University of New York